

# *Concordia* *Theological Monthly*

---

Vol. VIII

APRIL, 1937

No. 4

---

## **The Pastor and the Pastoral Cure of Souls**

As the pastor of today surveys the scene presented by life in twentieth-century America, the setting in which he must practise his profession, he cannot but be impressed by the increasing magnitude of the task set for him. This task is indeed many-sided. It includes the functions of the public ministry, the preaching of the Word and the public administration of the Sacraments; it includes the teaching functions of the ministry in the educational activities of the Church; it includes administrative tasks as executive head of a rather complex organization; it includes missionary activities and frequently service in synodical offices; it includes a prominence in the community at large, particularly when moral issues are at stake; and it includes the maintaining of delicately balanced social relationships with all types and classes of men. But the pastor's task certainly includes the cure of human souls, the personal healing ministry to the sin-sick souls of the individuals whose spiritual health and well-being he is obligated to foster and to promote. This task has in all ages been the most difficult of accomplishment of all the tasks imposed upon the ministry; but its difficulties have been immeasurably increased by the changes which have taken place in American life within the memory of generations now living.

These changes include particularly the accelerated pace at which modern life itself is moving today, the continuous change of behavior patterns in every relationship of life, and the resultant stress and strain upon the nervous and emotional system of the individual. Modern inventions and techniques, the fierce competition of an overindustrialized, socially maladjusted age, the curtailment of the productive span of man's life, the urbanization of rural areas through advanced means of communication,—these and many other factors have caused the currents of life to flow with almost incredible swiftness in the world of today. Even casual

observers will note that people everywhere are always busy. Every one seems to be perpetually in a hurry. There is an endless hustling and bustling about. Everything and everybody is incessantly in a state of flux. Momentous changes, upsetting all balances in industrial, business, and social organization, are continually impending. Thus men everywhere are exceedingly preoccupied with the pressing affairs of their daily lives and all too often have little time or energy to spare for spiritual interests.

Moreover, the accelerated pace at which life is moving today has produced friction at many points, as speed always will. People generally are nervous and emotionally unstable; they are easily irritated and aroused to resentment and anger. There is a tremendous increase in diseases which affect the nervous system and the mind of man. Observers have noted that men seem to be losing the ability to think clearly and dispassionately and that they seem increasingly reluctant to concentrate their attention upon subjects demanding abstract reasoning. These impatient, nervous, busy, practical men are not apt to give leisurely, respectful attention to their pastor when he seeks to minister to their souls, and they are more and more inclined to resent his admonitions and exhortations.

Other changes have occurred in the social and cultural life of man which profoundly affect the work of the pastor of today. Modern means of transportation and communication have broken down the walls which formerly isolated people in their group relationships. The spread of universal education has widened man's mental and cultural horizon, but has also exposed his mind and heart to many influences which are destructive of Christian ideals. The radio, the cinema, the newspaper, the illustrated magazine, the modern novel,—all these and many other productions of this age have done their share in crowding out of man's life the ideals of religion and in imposing upon the mass of Christians and non-Christians alike the moral code of Hollywood and the ethical standards of the underworld. The automobile and its growing offspring, the trailer, have in a measure succeeded in disrupting communal and family life and have created increasingly serious problems of a social and moral nature. The disintegration of family life alone, with its implied weakening of parental authority, its coarsening of emotional fiber, its loosening of the ties of moral restraint, has profoundly affected and magnified the task of the pastor. The repeal of prohibition with the amazing resurrection of the old-time saloon in a more attractive and hence more destructive guise, the alarming increase of the drinking habit in both men and women, the many problems that grow out of intemperance in every form,—all these have created new perplexities for the faithful pastor. The present laxity of the code of business ethics, the evils

of instalment buying, the loan shark, political corruption, the complex questions affecting the relationship of capital and labor,—Christian people are touched and influenced by all these momentous issues. All add new strands to the tangled web which makes up life in twentieth-century America. The pastor must deal with all these and with many other influences in his work of ministering to the souls of men. He cannot take men away from these environmental factors; men must live and work in the midst of them; so he must meet them, and somehow he must succeed, despite all obstacles, in his task of commanding the attention of men that he might minister to their immortal souls in their ever-increasing needs.

The pastor of today is further handicapped in his pastoral work by the low esteem in which he and his office are often held by the world and, alas, also by all too many Christians of this generation. The pastor of yesterday was indispensable to his people in every relationship of life. He was their friend, counselor, and guide. The guidance and comfort of religion were vital necessities to the mass of Christian people. Yesterday's pastor found an open door for his ministrations almost everywhere, and he was privileged, as a rule, to attend to his pastoral labors with a deep sense of satisfaction and joy. To many church people of today the pastor is no longer a counselor and guide in the affairs of life. It is his business to preach, and he is heard with a degree of patience when in the pulpit. But his pastoral attention, his personal ministry, is sought only in days of illness or distress by a considerable number of his members. Many call for his services only on the occasion of baptisms, weddings, or funerals. Even some of his most faithful members no longer regard the pastor with the reverence and respect common in Christians of an earlier age. They accept his ministrations with a new air of good-fellowship, of critical appraisal, of employerlike good will. It is not surprising that the pastor of today, being all too human, frequently goes about his pastoral duties with a heavy heart, that he is sometimes tempted to question the worth-whileness of his calling, that he is often oppressed with a sense of futility, a consciousness of defeat.

Yet definite signs of the dawning of a new day of opportunity for the Christian ministry are not wanting. The gods of materialism, so ardently worshiped by the world and all too many Christians in the days of prosperity, have not given longed-for happiness and satisfaction to their devotees. The day of disillusionment has come for many who in more prosperous days had turned away from the service of God to the service of Mammon. The dizzy days of the third decade of the twentieth century, with their prevailing "success" philosophy, are gone. Books on "how to succeed" are no

longer best sellers. Self-hypnotism as a substitute for an adequate, satisfying philosophy of life has had its day. The closing days of the third decade, with the collapse of man's pet schemes for self-enrichment and self-aggrandizement, definitely ushered in a new day, when men, bankrupt in wealth and assurance, once more seek comfort and peace in the realm of religion. True, in the world at large this new approach to religion is all too frequently not along the lines well established in the Law and Gospel; it all too often expends its energies fruitlessly in the fields of philosophy, sociology, metaphysics, and psychology; but it does indicate the dawn of a new day of opportunity and blessed service for the Christian minister and for the Christian Church in every department of Christian work. Men have become conscious of a great void in their hearts and lives, a void which can be adequately filled only by the truths and comforts of Christ's religion. The Church has never had more glorious opportunities than she has in this age of man's disillusionment. There was never a greater need for consecrated men to devote their lives to the Christian ministry and to bring to the longing hearts of men the comfort and peace of the Gospel through faithful missionary and pastoral work. And the Lutheran pastor of today, equipped with unshaken faith and profound love for souls, bearing the unadulterated Gospel of God's salvation, must realize that in God's providence he has been made a "keeper of the wells of salvation" in one of the most critical periods of human history, and both in his missionary and in his pastoral work he must eagerly seize every opportunity to minister to the dying souls of sin-sick men. He will find that the people of his flock, to whom he is primarily obligated, also have been affected by the many influences in the world of today which are destructive of Christian faith, that they are no longer the simple, unsophisticated, pious folk to whom his predecessors were privileged to minister, that the "cure of souls," always a delicate and difficult work, has grown to be a more difficult task with each succeeding year, that his work is all too often not appreciated even by his own people. He will often be compelled to go about his pastoral work with a heavy heart; but he must go about it nevertheless and do his work with undiminished faith and love. Conscious of his high calling, he will, he must, be spurred on by greater needs to greater efforts. And as his people, sin-sick, weary, disillusioned in life, again turn to him and his ministry for comfort and strength, he will rise to new heights of glorious achievement in his pastoral office.

To do this, the pastor will require a special measure of God's grace in these troublous times. After all, God's work is accomplished "not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." Paul, facing ever-increasing difficulties, thought

that the removal of his "thorn in the flesh" would make for greater effectiveness in his ministry; but the Lord knew and understood his needs better than he. "My grace is sufficient for thee; for My strength is made perfect in weakness." The faithful pastor will come to an ever-increasing realization of his own inadequacy, his shortcomings in his pastoral work, as conditions in the world grow increasingly evil; but this realization will not drive him to despair. His sense of personal inadequacy will, on the contrary, drive him to a new assurance of, and a new reliance upon, the grace and mercy of God in Christ, and he will say with St. Paul: "I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me."

Relying and wholly depending upon the grace of God in Christ, the pastor will not only be imbued with new courage and faith in the performance of his pastoral work, but he will also be fired with a new determination to overcome his inadequacies and shortcomings through diligent labor and intelligent application lest he hinder the workings of God's grace both in himself and in those to whom he must minister. He will again and again begin a sincere self-examination and an examination of his human equipment for the purpose of increasing his knowledge and understanding of man's needs and of God's grace. He will again and again critically appraise his pastoral work, its spirit and its techniques, in the light of the Word of God in order not to fail his people in their need. And we believe that such "stock-taking" will lead the pastor of today to certain conclusions, a few of which we shall attempt to outline.

The first of these conclusions is this, that to minister intelligently and effectively to the souls of men, the pastor of today must know and understand the contemporary world and the peculiar needs of men in this age. It is true, fundamentally the world and the needs of men have not changed. Life is still marred and corrupted by sin, and men still need the grace of God in Christ for their salvation. The faithful pastor must still denounce and expose sin and lead sinners to faith in Christ in his personal work among men. There is still the same hardness of heart, the same disinclination to be humble, the same unbelief, which have caused servants of the Word so much concern since the days of the prophets. Sickness, poverty, reverses, and troubles of every kind, the infirmities of old age and death, are still as of old the great destroyers of human happiness. All this is true. But it is also an undeniable fact that the patterns of life and of man's behavior have changed greatly since the days of our fathers. Life is today undergoing continuous changes before our very eyes. Every one will agree that the world in which we are living today is an infinitely more complex world than was the world of yesterday.

Sin appears today in ever new guises and in ever cleverer disguises, the ills that have plagued men of old have today produced broods of offspring even more vexing than their begetters; men have grown more weary, more sophisticated, more calloused to sin, more enamored of the world, more resistant to the grace of God in these latter days. The pastor of today must understand and properly evaluate these changes if he would minister effectively to the men of his generation. He must comprehend the peculiar psychology of the times, the preoccupation of men with their business affairs, the nervous tension under which men are living, the fear complex which characterizes this age. He must appreciate the tremendous "pull" which the seductions of the modern world exert on a generation of Christians surfeited with the precious Word, a generation which has never had to pay for its blessings, which never had to bleed and die for its faith. He must realize the new subtlety of sin and worldliness; even earnest Christians often wonder just where the line between good and evil must be drawn. The pastor must know a good deal about the problems which men engaged in business and industry, in the arts, sciences, and professions, must face in these days; for all of them have far-reaching moral and spiritual implications. Perplexed men will look to him increasingly for guidance in these matters. Men are beginning to discover the fact that the wisdom of the world has not been equal to the task of creating a social order in which men may live peacefully with a good conscience. The bankrupt world is increasingly looking to religion, to religious leaders, for guidance, and justly so; for Christianity has long proclaimed that "all other things" shall be "added unto" those who seek "first the kingdom of God and His righteousness." Those who assert that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come" dare not disappoint men who plead with them to answer questions of every-day life and to lead them in the way of godliness.

The pastor of today must moreover be no stranger to the thinking of the poor and disinherited, that vast, seething mass of underprivileged humanity which must exist on the dole in one form or another from cradle to grave, which is denied the chance to work and to live a satisfying life in an overorganized world, and out of which will probably come the answer, and it may be a violent one, to many of the social and economic riddles of today. The gradual disappearance of the middle class in American life is pressing our Lutheran people into this "modern poor" class in increasing numbers, and it is the pastor's business to watch over the souls of those who are slipping in their social scale, lest they also slip in their Christian faith and life. The pastor of today must also

be able to understand and properly evaluate the effects upon his people of universal education, of scientific thinking, of the rationalistic interpretations of divine truths so common today, and of a thousand and one phenomena in the contemporary world, which all profoundly affect the great work he is attempting to do by God's grace, "curing" the sin-sick souls and the sin-marred lives of men with the medicine of the Word of God. Certainly these reflections will cause the pastor, on the one hand, to become a man given to much reading and study, not only in the field of theology, but in almost every other field of human endeavor, and, on the other hand, to lead him to seek the acquaintance of men in every walk of life in order that he may constantly grow in his knowledge of life and in his understanding of the specific needs of all his people.

This growing understanding of life and people will, we believe, not only broaden the sympathies of the pastor and aid him in preserving patience and good will, upon which the pastor of today must daily draw in his pastoral work, but it will lead him also to the developing of new techniques in his approach to both human problems and his people. It is an undeniable fact that the relationship between pastor and people in the world of today has been profoundly affected by the temper of the times. There was a day when the pastor's word was "law" to his people. His authority was unquestioned. He was able to denounce evil and chastise men for their sins in the fashion of the prophets of old. His "Thus saith the Lord" settled all disputes and ended all arguments. It is, alas, no longer thus. The faith of all too many Christians has been vitiated by worldliness, their love to God has grown cold. There is no longer that close acquaintance with, and that deep reverence for, the Word of God which distinguished Christians in the days of our fathers. Ours is an age marked by skepticism, and our Christian people have not escaped its influence. The "scientific method," implanted even in schoolchildren, teaches man to question every assertion and the authority of every one. The significant stock phrase of this "debunking" generation is the vulgar, but expressive "Oh, yeah?" and the observant pastor of today will not fail to note that this skeptical spirit has invaded also his people and has affected their attitudes in the realm of religion to a considerable degree.

This being true, it follows that to be successful in his personal ministry, to "break through," the pastor of today must in many cases use a new method of approach. Men laboring in other fields of human endeavor have made the same discovery. And out of their thinking has come what is known as the "psychological approach," a method of approach based on new knowledge of the

psychology of men. Medicine recognizes the effectiveness of this approach, it has been developed in legal practise, business uses it particularly in the field of salesmanship. Trained social workers of today no longer approach problems in social case work exclusively from the sociological angle, but also through the channels of psychology. Modern educational methods are built on better knowledge of child psychology. And so men laboring in pastoral work in the world of today are discovering that a psychologically sound approach will in many cases bring favorable results when the more direct method has failed. It must be admitted that blunt and unsparing denunciation of sin, particularly "wholesale" or general condemnation of some form of sinful pleasure, will no longer command respectful attention, particularly on the part of our younger members. They are simply not impressed by it, as many a pastor has discovered to his sorrow. Solemn warnings on the part of the pastor to beware of lurking dangers to the soul in some popular form of amusement, in the practises that prevail in the social life of schools and colleges, etc., result all too often in charges of "old fogeyism."

Even the truths of God's Word, expressed in the vigorous, blunt, dogmatic fashion of another age, are heard all too often with visible lack of interest even by a great many of our own Lutheran people. These are facts, and pastors must face them; for they enter very deeply into every activity of the ministry. No doubt these conditions are much to be lamented; without question they are signs of decaying spiritual life among our people and of the increasing worldliness of church-members. But it certainly is without purpose merely to bewail the evils of this age without proceeding to seek ways and means by which unfavorable conditions may be overcome. It is indeed a simple matter vigorously to condemn present trends, to insist sternly that it is the duty of a faithful pastor never to deny the truth, to denounce those who press for an adaptation of techniques in pastoral work to conditions as they exist in every-day life in this age, and then to complain, somewhat resentful of the success of others, that somehow God's Word does not seem to be prospering at our hands, that for some reason missionary prospects do not seem to be attracted to our Church, that without apparent reason even loyal members are growing impatient, unsympathetic, and critical. Let every pastor recall that our Savior Himself did not by any means employ the same method of approach in His dealings with different types of men, that St. Paul, the most effective instrument of God in the building of His kingdom, was willing to be made "all things to all men" that he might "by all means save some." St. Paul's methods of approach were always adapted to the situation and the needs

of the men among whom he ministered. Surely the pastor of today can do no better than to follow his example.

Lest we be misunderstood, let us emphasize the fact that a proper and effective approach in pastoral work does not imply that the pastor must on occasion condone sin and error or that he must vitiate the sweet message of the Gospel by making it more palatable to human reason. But it does imply that the pastor of today do not offend by a bluntly denunciatory manner, that he take into account the temper of men in this day, that understanding patience, sympathy, compassion, love, be registered in his attitude rather than offended righteousness, stern dogmatism, and unsparing wrath against sin or sinners. Remembering his own infirmities, the frailty of man, and the temptations and tribulations of the present world, the understanding pastor will ever strive to strike the right note in his dealings with individual members of his flock. Yes, we realize that this is not a newly discovered truth, that tact and pastoral wisdom were advocated by our fathers, even though they employed other terms in describing these desirable traits. But we believe that it is possible for us to come to an even better understanding of the importance of the proper approach in pastoral work in our day, and the observation that the work of so many faithful pastors is obviously not registering with their people because of their unwillingness to vary their method of approach may serve as sufficient reason for touching upon this subject.

The thought may occur here to the minds of some readers that we are requiring more of the pastor of today than God's Word requires. Is it no longer true that faithfulness is God's great and only requirement of men in the Christian ministry, that the consequences attending our faithful work are "none of our business," but are God's business, that "we can only sow the seed, God must give the increase," that God's Word is in itself a power of God unto salvation, and that it does not depend for its effectiveness on the manner of presentation? 'Tis true, all that is required of the pastor by God is that he be found faithful; but faithfulness in the pastoral office includes also the full employment of reason and the diligent acquisition of such skills and techniques as will make his pastoral work more effective. God's Word certainly is "a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth"; but it is an undeniable fact that the pastor may do much to hinder that power by the lack of an understanding, loving spirit. True enough, we can only sow the seed, God must give the increase; but the increase God will give will depend in a measure upon the manner of sowing. The careful planning of his method of approach in each case, taking into account the many factors involved in every situation, will cer-

tainly not lessen the faithful pastor's sense of dependence upon God and His blessing if he strives at the same time to come ever closer to God in prayer and meditation of His Word.

There is, however, a very real danger that a busy pastor may more or less subconsciously acquire and reveal a spirit and an air of what is known as "professionalism" in his personal ministry. It is true, when engaging in pastoral work, the minister is acting in a professional capacity; but the slightest indication that he is thinking of his work in terms of what social workers call "case work," that his work in dealing with a member is a routine "job" in his professional life, will surely detract from the effectiveness of his personal ministry. Nor does it add to his "dignity." Men today do not think professional airs on the part of the physician, the lawyer, the pastor, particularly impressive. Professionalism smacks of hypocrisy to the modern mind. Since the cure of souls is the most intimately personal service any man may engage in, and since a primary condition of success in personal ministrations is confidence and trust in the heart of the person to whom he is ministering, the pastor's approach must always be marked by frankness and sincerity, by those qualities which we seek to express in the terms *natural* or *human*. The erring member must be able to sense the real, personal concern for his soul's welfare in the heart of the pastor who is admonishing him. The sick member must be impressed by the very real personal interest the pastor is taking in his physical and spiritual condition and which is revealed in every conversation, in every prayer at his bedside. Youth must feel that its problems are the pastor's problems; age must know that its burdens are the pastor's burdens. Thus the pastor may and will enter deeply and effectively into the life of every one of his members, and they will in the end love, honor, and respect him, even in this frivolous age, as a real pastor, a real shepherd of their souls, as one of God's choicest gifts to His children.

Among Lutherans the very real dependence of the pastor of yesterday, today, and tomorrow upon the Word of God need surely not be emphasized. The Word of God has been, is, and always must be the Lutheran pastor's inspiration, guide, and tool in every activity of his ministry, including particularly also the cure of souls. From the Word the pastor draws his commission to "cure" the souls of men, in the Word he finds a catalog of the diseases which afflict his charges, into the Word he must ever penetrate, as into a divine pharmacopoeia, for the effective remedies which alone can "cure" the sin-afflicted souls and sin-marred lives of men. But the pastor of today must above all himself really be at home, really live, in the Word of God if he would minister effectively to the souls and lives of men in these troublous times. For the Lord

Himself, whose servant every faithful pastor would be, lives in the pages of the Word, and whosoever is at home in the Word is at home with the Lord. It is the abiding presence of the Lord in his life which is the pastor's protection against the sins which mightily assail him in his pastoral office; it is his nearness to the Lord which is his defense against discouragement and unfaithfulness; it is his life in the Lord which blossoms forth daily in new victories achieved for the Kingdom. Really to live in the Word means to use it not merely as a quarry from which to hew texts for the sermon or as a depository of comforting sayings from which to cull readings at sick-beds or as a treasure-house of truth from which to construct a dogmatic system of religious teaching. To live in the Word means to make use of it as a thirsty man will make use of a spring of clear water, as a starving man will make use of a loaf of bread, as a sick man will make use of a healing remedy, as a dying man will make use of a new lease on life. The ability—or let us rather say the grace—to use the Word of God in this fashion, is, after all, the *sine qua non*, the chief, the one indispensable requirement of him who would minister to the souls of men. Even the most brilliantly endowed, the most learned, the most eloquent, the most sympathetic-minded pastor who does not live his life in the Lord will fail in his attempt to "cure" the souls of men.

There comes to mind the well-known touching legend which relates that the Apostle John once demanded of a presbyter information concerning a certain young man whom the apostle had committed to the presbyter's care. The presbyter related sorrowfully that, alas, the young man had fallen away from Christ and was now living in a mountain fastness far away as a much-feared highwayman. Instantly the holy apostle was astir with solicitude for this erring soul. Despite discomfort and danger he sought out the young man, and when he had found him, he fell at the feet of the youth and would not rise until the backslider had given heed to his entreaties and returned to the fold. "That attitude," says a commentator, "was worthy of the friend who had lain on Jesus' bosom, who drank in the Master's spirit."

So the pastor of today who lives in the very presence of the Lord will ever bear all his people in his loving heart. He will identify himself with them in their joys as well as in their sorrows. He is enriched when his people are blessed with gifts from God; he suffers poverty when his people suffer reverses. He offers thanks to God when one of his charges manifests the grace of God in his life; he is dismayed, regarding himself as lacking in faithfulness, when another falls from grace. He watches over one member with anxiety, fearful lest he suffer the loss of his faith

in some adversity; over another lest he be weaned from his faith by his success in life. He endeavors to strengthen the feet of the young that they may walk in the paths of righteousness; he upholds the hands of the aged that they may not falter in their trust. He is ever ready to sit at the bedside of a stricken member and ever at hand to accompany the dying to the very gates of eternity. Like Paul he says to all his members: "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you," even though he, too, is often constrained to add with the apostle: "though, the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved."

For it is truly not to be loved or respected or rewarded in any fashion that the faithful Lutheran pastor of today, like his forebears, ministers to all his members in their varied needs. It is rather the love of Christ which constrains him to be faithful in the "cure" of souls. Tasting and experiencing that love in his own life day after day, he cannot but express it in his personal attitudes and in his pastoral work.

Buffalo, N. Y.

H. F. WIND

---

### Kleine Hesekielstudien

---

#### 4. Der gute Hirte, Kap. 34

In der Inhaltsangabe und Einteilung des schwierigen, aber ganz herrlichen Buches des großen Propheten Hesekiel ist schon hervorgehoben worden, daß, während er zuerst destruktiv gewirkt und die falschen Hoffnungen Israels begraben hat, er von Kap. 33 an konstruktiv wirkt und die große Hoffnung Israels aufrichtet. Den Wendepunkt bildet, wie ebenfalls schon bemerkt worden ist, die Nachricht, W. 21, daß Jerusalem gefallen ist, daß also der Prophet durch die Erfüllung seiner bisherigen Weissagungen und symbolischen Handlungen als wahrer Prophet erwiesen worden ist. Er verkündigt von jetzt an denen, die sich durch die Gerichte Gottes, wie sie sein prophetisches Wort angekündigt hatte, zu wahrer Buße hatten leiten lassen, den Betrübten Israels, das Heil, zunächst zeitliches Heil, daß Gottes Volk in der Babylonischen Gefangenschaft nicht untergehen, sondern zu der von Gott bestimmten Zeit in sein Land zurückkehren werde, aber dann vor allem geistliches Heil durch den rechten Knecht David, den König Messias, Kap. 34, 23, 24; 37, 24. Diese Heilspredigt wird eingeleitet durch das Wort Kap. 33, 11: „So wahr als ich lebe, spricht der Herr Herr, ich habe keinen Gefallen am Tode des Gottlosen, sondern daß sich der Gottlose bekehre von seinem Wesen und lebe. So bekehret euch doch nun von eurem bösen Wesen. Warum wollt ihr sterben, ihr vom Hause Israel?“ Und der Höhepunkt der ganzen Weissagung ist dann die wunderbar schöne Stelle von dem

guten Hirten, Kap. 34, 11—16, eine der vornehmsten messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testaments und, auf die praktische Bedeutung und Verwendung gesehen, in V. 16 ein besonders schöner Text für das Werk der Inneren Mission im engeren Sinne des Wortes, der Stadt- und Anstaltsmission. Das hebräische Original ist so ausnehmend schön und zugleich so leicht zu lesen, daß wir die Leser, die dieser Sprache mächtig sind, bitten, es beständig zu vergleichen, weshalb wir auch einige sprachliche Bemerkungen und Verweisungen beigeben für solche, die auf die sprachliche Seite achten möchten.

Wir lassen zunächst, da die betreffenden Verse sehr eng zusammenhängen, eine wörtliche Übersetzung des Abschnitts folgen und dann eine weitere Ausführung und Erklärung. „Denn so spricht der Allherr Jehovah: Siehe, ich selbst, ich werde meine Schafe suchen und mich ihrer annehmen. Wie ein Hirte sich seiner Herde annimmt am Tage, da er inmitten seiner zerstreuten Schafe steht, so werde ich mich annehmen meiner Schafe und sie erretten aus allen Orten, wohin sie zerstreut worden sind am Tage des Gewölks und Wollendunkels. Und ich will sie herausführen aus den Völkern und sie sammeln aus den Ländern und sie bringen in ihr Land und will sie weiden auf den Bergen Israels, in den Tälern und an allen Wohnplätzen des Landes. Auf guter Weide will ich sie weiden, und auf den hohen Bergen Israels wird ihre Flur sein; dort werden sie sich lagern auf schöner Flur, und fette Weide werden sie weiden auf den Bergen Israels. Ich selbst will meine Schafe weiden, und ich selbst will sie sich lagern lassen, spricht der Allherr Jehovah. Das Verlorene will ich suchen und das Versprengte wiederbringen und das Gebrochene verbinden und das Kranke stärken, aber das Fette und das Starke will ich vertilgen, will es weiden nach dem Rechte“, V. 11—16. „Und ich werde ercheiden über sie einen einigen Hirten, daß er sie weide, meinen Knecht David; der wird sie weiden und ihnen Hirte sein. Aber ich selbst, Jehovah, werde ihnen Gott sein und mein Knecht David Fürst in ihrer Mitte. Ich, Jehovah, habe es geredet“, V. 23, 24.

Die ganze Weissagung ist sehr klar und ebennächtig aufgebaut, bietet auch keine nennenswerten sprachlichen Schwierigkeiten oder grammatischen Unregelmäßigkeiten. Es sind vier Hauptgedanken: V. 11 bis 13a; 13b—15; 16; 23, 24. Die einzelnen Gedanken heben sich scharf voneinander ab und lassen sich unter das Thema zusammenfassen: *Der Herr der Hirte seiner Schafe.* Schön bemerkte Luther zu diesem Vergleich des Herrn mit einem Hirten: „Die andern Namen . . ., welche die Schrift Gott gibt, lauten etwas zu herrlich und majestätisch und bringen gleich eine Scheu und Furcht mit sich, wenn man sie hört nennen. Als wenn die Schrift Gott nennt unsfern Herrn, König, Schöpfer usw. Der Act ist das Wörtlein ‚Hirte‘ nicht, sondern lautet gar freundlich und bringt den Gottheligen, wenn sie es lesen oder hören, gleich eine Übersicht, Trost und Sicherheit mit, wie das Wort Vater und

andere mehr, wenn sie Gotte zugeeignet werden.“<sup>1)</sup> Oft wird darum der Herr in dieser Weise Hirte genannt, besonders in den Psalmen und in den Propheten, Ps. 23 und 80; Jes. 40, 11; Sach. 11, 7—14; 13, 7, mit Hinweis auf den neutestamentlichen guten Hirten, Christum, Joh. 10, 12—16; 1 Petr. 2, 25; Hebr. 13, 20. Dieses Thema: Der Herr der Hirte seiner Schafe, war durch den Kontext nahegelegt. V. 1—10 steht nämlich ein großes Wehe über die untreuen, bösen Hirten Israels, die gottlosen Könige, die ja Jesekiel's Zeitgenossen waren. Diese waren nur auf ihren eigenen Vorteil bedacht, verirrtenlosen die Schafe, ließen sie zerstreut werden und in die Irre gehen, werden darum in Gottes gerechte Strafe fallen. Im Gegensatz zu ihnen will sich Jehovah seiner armen Herde annehmen und sie aus der Verstreutung sammeln. Dies ist der erste Gedanke, V. 11—13a.

Der ganze Text wird eingeleitet mit der feierlichen Formel: „Denn so spricht der Herr Herr.“<sup>2)</sup> Jehovah ist es, der diese Verheißung gibt, der treue Bundesgott, der seine Verheißungen hält und wahr macht; und zugleich ist es Adonai, der starke Gott, der Allherr, der wirklich tun kann, was er tun will. Zu beachten ist dann das absolut voraufgestellte emphatische „Siehe, ich, ich selbst“. Die Authorized Version übersetzt treffend: „Behold, I, even I“, die Revised Version: „I Myself, even I.“ Und dann folgt, was Jehovah tun will. Er will seine Herde suchen, שׁׁרֵר (LXX: ἐκτηνῶω), und genau untersuchen, ἐπαρ (LXX: ἐπορεύουμ). Dies zweite Wort bezeichnet zugleich das liebevolle Sich-annehmen der Herde. Beides steht im scharfen Gegensatz zu der Weise der schlechten Hirten, V. 6. Ganz praktisch bemerkt dazu der alte Starke in seiner „Synopsis“: „Dieses ist nicht also zu deuten, als wenn sich Gott im Alten Testamente seines Volks gar nicht angenommen, sondern dasselbe dem bösen Willen der untreuen Hirten lediglich überlassen hätte . . . sondern es wird eine besondere Wohltat damit angedeutet, daß der Messias, der Sohn Gottes, in eigener Person das Amt verwalten wird.“

Dieses Tun Jehovahs für sein Volk wird dann in V. 12 verglichen mit der Pflege, die ein rechter Hirte seinen zerstreuten Schafen angedeihen läßt: „Wie ein Hirte sich seiner Herde annimmt am Tage, da

1) Auslegung des 23. Psalms. St. Louisier Ausg. V, 261. Vgl. die ganze schöne Auslegung, die Luther wahrscheinlich im Jahre 1535 „auf einen Abend über Tisch nach dem Gratias“ gehalten hat, 254—291.

2) Über die Punktation des hebräischen Textes תְּהִנָּה יְהֹוָה vergleiche Gesenius-Kautsch, Grammatik, § 17, c. Es ist ein sogenanntes Qere perpetuum. Wenn die beiden Gottesnamen יְהֹוָה, Allherr, und תְּהִנָּה, Herr, nebeneinander gebraucht wurden, konnte der spätere Jude statt des für ihn unausprechbaren Gottesnamens Jehovah nicht, wie sonst, Adonai lesen und die Vokale dieses Namens dem Worte Jehovah befügen, sondern las dann für Jehovah den andern Gottesnamen, Elohim, und fügte die Vokale des Wortes תְּהִנָּה dem Gottesnamen Jehovah bei.

er inmitten seiner zerstreuten Schafe steht.“<sup>3)</sup> Und dieses Tun des Hirten wird dann in seine einzelnen Stücke zerlegt. Das erste ist, daß er die zerstreute Herde von allen Orten sammelt. Doch steht hier nicht der Ausdruck „sammeln“, sondern das bezeichnendere Wort „erretten“: „So werde ich mich annehmen meiner Schafe und sie erretten aus allen Orten, wohin sie zerstreut worden sind.“ Darin liegt, daß die Schafe in der Verstreitung unter einem Druck, unter einer schweren Knechtschaft schmachten. Vgl. 2 Mos. 6, 6, wo dasselbe Wort von der Befreiung aus Ägypten gebraucht ist: „Ich bin der Herr und will euch ausführen von euren Lastern in Ägypten und will euch erretten von eurem Frönen und will euch erlösen durch einen ausgeredten Arm und große Gerichte.“ Die letzten Worte des 12. Verses: „am Tage der Wolke und des Wollendunkels“, heißen soviel wie „am Tage des Gerichts“. Das Bild ist hergenommen vom Gewittersturm. Auch sonst wird der Gerichtstag mit solchen Ausdrücken bezeichnet. Die Dunkelheit, die Finsternis erhöht die Schrecken des Gerichts. Vgl. Joel 2, 2; Zeph. 1, 15. In V. 13a wird dann die Sammlung der Verstreuten noch weiter beschrieben: „Und ich will sie herausführen aus den Völkern und sie sammeln aus den Ländern und sie bringen in ihr Land.“

V. 13b bis 15 enthält den zweiten Gedanken: Nachdem der Hirte die Verstreuten gesammelt und in ihr eigenes Land geführt hat, wird er sie. Das ist sein Tun an ihnen und für sie. Und zwar wird es gute, treffliche Weide sein, auf die er sie führt. Dies wird durch die einzelnen Ausdrücke besonders betont. Er weidet sie auf den Bergen, wo die Sonne gute Weide schafft, und in den Tälern, wo die Feuchtigkeit Fruchtbarkeit erzeugt, „auf allen Wohnplätzen des Landes“.<sup>4)</sup> V. 14 wird dann noch besonders gesagt, daß es gute, fette Weide ist, auf die der gute Hirte sie führt, Weide auf fruchtbaren Fluren oder Triften, d.h. wie sie sich auf den „hohen Bergen Israels“ finden. So nennt der Prophet öfters das israelitische Bergland im Unterschied von dem flachen Niederland Babyloniens oder Mesopotamiens, wo er und die Exulanten sich jetzt befinden. Vgl. Kap. 17, 23. Jehobah weidet jedoch nicht bloß seine Herde, sondern er behütet sie auch dabei, er läßt sie sich lagern in behaglicher Ruhe, in Sicherheit und Frieden, wie durch Wiederholung

3) Im Hebräischen steht das Wort „Schafe“ im Singular, ist aber mit dem Partizipium „verstreut“ im Plural verbunden, weil eben eine Herde aus vielen einzelnen Schafen besteht (constructio ad sensum). *W.* Kleinbich, Schafe, der Regel nach Maskulinum, sehr selten Femininum, ist hier mit einem Femininum verbunden, aber weiter unten als Maskulinum konstruiert. Das Maskulinum ist im Hebräischen das *genus potius*. *Gesenius-Kautsch*, § 135, o; 122, g.

4) Das *h*, zu, vor *תְּמִימָה* in V. 13 steht im Sinne von *h*, auf; ebenso in V. 14 und sonst in ziemlich vielen Fällen. Es liegt dabei eine Verschmelzung zweier verschiedener Vorstellungen vor, der Bewegung nach einem Ort und des Seins oder Handelns an demselben. *Gesenius-Kautsch*, § 119, g. *Gesenius-Bühl*, Wörterbuch, sub *h*.

der Aussage in B. 15 besonders hervorgehoben wird. In diesem Verse ist auch das Pronomen „ich“ wieder zweimal besonders gesetzt, wie schon B. 11, und nicht bloß im Verbum enthalten, ist also nachdrücklich bestont: *ঁ* *ঁ*, ich will es tun. Deutlich erinnern die Ausdrücke an den 23. Psalm.

B. 16 wird sodann ein dritter Gedanke hervorgehoben. Der gute Hirte nimmt sich des Teiles seiner Herde besonders an, der besonderer Pflege bedarf, der Verlorenen, der Verirrten, der Verwundeten und der Kranken.<sup>5)</sup> Jeder Begriff hat ein ihm entsprechendes Verbum bei sich. Das Verlorne will Jehovah suchen, das Versprengte oder Verirrte wiederbringen, das Gebrochene, Verwundete verbinden, das Kranke stärken. Die Ausdrücke sind gehäuft nach den bekannten Weise Hesekials, sind aber ganz klar. Der Herr tut damit das direkte Gegenteil von dem, was die schlechten Hirten tun, B. 4. Umstritten ist jedoch die zweite Hälfte des Verses. Nach dem massoretischen Text kann nur übersetzt werden: „Aber das Fette und das Starke will ich vertilgen.“ Die Konjunktion ist dann nicht mit „und“, sondern adversativ mit „aber“ zu übersetzen. Zu beachten ist auch, daß vor diesem Sahtteil der Atnach steht, die große Interpunktions, daß also offenbar etwas Neues kommt. Die Septuaginta hat nun aber statt *רְשָׁאָרָא*, „ich will vertilgen“, gelesen *רְשָׁאָרָא*, „ich will bewahren“. Ebenso die althyrische Peshitta und die lateinische Vulgata: *Et quod pingue et forte custodiam.* Ihnen folgte Luther und übersetzte: „Und was fett und stark ist, will ich behüten.“ Die Fetten und Starken wären dann solche, die dem Hirten Freude machen. Aber dazu paßt nicht der Schluß: „ich will sie weiden nach Recht“. Und namentlich dürfen wir auch nicht ohne zwingende Not den massoretischen Text verlassen, und in diesem Texte steht *רְשָׁאָרָא*, und *רְשָׁאָרָא* heißt nur „vertilgen“. Die Authorized Version übersetzt deshalb richtig: „But I will destroy the fat and the strong“; ebenso die Revised Version. Die Fetten und Starken sind dann diejenigen, die sich selbst für gesund und stark halten, die des Arztes nicht bedürfen. Diese will Jehovah auch weiden, aber, wie es am Schluße heißt, „mit Recht“, „mit Gericht“. Dieses Lehte „weiden“ ist also ein Oxymeron, eine Redefigur, die einen scheinbaren Widerspruch zwischen dem Subjekt und dem Prädikat oder Attribut des Sages ausdrückt. Daz dies wirklich der richtige Sinn ist, zeigt dann auch der Kontext. Da werden die fetten und starken Schafe näher charakterisiert, und Jehovah kündigt an, daß er sie richten werde wegen ihrer Frevel und Gewalttaten. Dieses Vertilgen der Fetten und

5) Die *participia feminini* sind als Neutra zu fassen, da die hebräische Sprache kein Neutrumb hat. Eigentlich sind es Kollektivbegriffe, die zunächst auf Maskulina geben, aber in Femininform als *collectiva* dargestellt werden. *Gesenius-Kautsch*, § 122, p. q. s. Vgl. im Griechischen ἡ Λοτος, die Reiterei, ἡ κάμηλος, die Kamele. Über die Femininierung *רְ* statt *רִ* vergleiche § 80, e. Sie ist im allgemeinen seltener, nur bei Partizipien, wie hier, häufiger. Die Form *רְשָׁאָרָא* mit Pathach erklärt sich aus dem Guttural, § 80, d.

Starken zeigt, daß die Liebe Jehovahs mit Gerechtigkeit gepaart ist. Vgl. V. 17—19, besonders V. 20—22.<sup>6)</sup>

V. 23 und 24 folgt nun der vierte Gedanke. Jehovah sagt, daß er dies alles ausrichten will durch seinen Knecht David. Dieser Hirte und Knecht David ist offenbar der Messias. Es ist nicht der frühere König David gemeint, wie Nationalisten ausgelegt haben. Denn das hebräische Wort *רָאֵבֶן* heißt nicht: vom Tode auferwecken, sondern es ist stehender Ausdruck für das Auftreten einer Person, die Gott erweckt und sendet. So findet sich dieses Wort gerade in messianischen Stellen; vgl. die messianischen Grundstellen 5 Mose. 18, 15, 18 und 2 Sam. 7, 12. Dieser Knecht ist auch nicht irgendein Nachkomme Davids, etwa Serubabel, der die Juden aus dem Exil zurückführte, wie Grotius und andere „judentzende“ Ausleger meinen. Dieser Hirte und Knecht David ist derselbe, der sonst Same Davids heißt, 2 Sam. 7, 12, oder Gewächs Davids, Jer. 23, 5; 33, 15, der rechte Davidssohn. Er heißt auch an andern Stellen, und zwar gerade in messianischen Weissagungen, ganz direkt David, gerade wie hier. Hosea sagt, Kap. 3, 5: „Danach werden sich die Kinder Israels bekehren und den Herrn, ihren Gott, und ihren König David suchen und werden den Herrn und seine Gnade ehren in der letzten Zeit.“ Jeremiaß weissagt, Kap. 30, 9: „Jacob „muß nicht mehr den Fremden dienen, sondern dem Herrn, ihrem Gott, und ihrem König David, welchen ich ihnen erwecken will.“ Und Hesekiel selbst hat noch einmal diese Weissagung, Kap. 37, 24: „Mein Knecht David soll ihr König und ihrer aller einziger Hirte sein.“ Luther sagt in seiner berühmten „Auslegung der letzten Worte Davids“, die wie kaum eine andere Schrift das richtige Verständnis messianischer Weissagungen vermittelt: „Daher wird auch unser Herr Christus oft in den Propheten mit dem Namen seines Vaters David genannt, Hos. 3, 5: „Danach werden sich die Kinder Israels bekehren und den Herrn, ihren Gott, und David, ihren König suchen und den Herrn und seine Gnade ehren in der letzten Zeit.“ Hier heißt David unser Herr Christus und wird in gleiche Ehre mit Gott gesetzt und Herr genannt, den sie suchen und ehren werden. Es ist einerlei Suchen, damit sie Gott und ihren König suchen und ehren sollen; gleichwie wir mit einerlei Glauben den Vater und Sohn ehren, nicht mit einem andern Glauben den Vater und mit einem andern den Sohn ehren. . . . Item, Ezech. 34, 23. 24: „Ich will ihnen einen einzigen Hirten erwecken, der sie weiden soll, nämlich meinen Knecht David. Der wird sie weiden und ihr Hirte sein; ich will ihr Gott sein, und mein Knecht David wird Fürst unter ihnen sein.“ Hier heißt Christus

6) Es läßt sich auch leicht erklären, wie die Septuaginta zu ihrer irrigen Übersetzung gekommen ist. Beim Lesen und Abschreiben eines Manuskripts konnten Versehen vorkommen, und besonders leicht konnten einander ähnlich sehende Buchstaben verwechselt werden; und solche im hebräischen einander ähnlich sehende Buchstaben sind *ת* und *ת*, die auch an andern Stellen des hebräischen Textes im Laufe der Zeit verwechselt wurden.

stus David und Gottes Knecht, wie er auch Jes. 52, 13 Gottes Knecht heißt und an viel Orten mehr. Dazu Paulus Phil. 2 macht einen Knecht aus ihm, der ihn doch immer und immer einen rechten Gott predigt, da er spricht, V. 5—7: „Ein jeglicher sei gesinnet wie Jesus Christus, welcher, ob er wohl in göttlicher Gestalt war, hielt er es nicht für einen Raub Gott gleich sein, sondern äußerte sich selbst und nahm knechtlich Gestalt an“ usw. Läßt uns den Apostel fragen, wie er so ungeschickt mag reden? Ist Christus Gott gleich, wie kann er ein Knecht und in Knechtsgestalt sein? Ist er ein Knecht, wie kann er Gott gleich und in Gottes Gestalt sein? Aber wir Christen verstehen und wissen solches alles wohl; aber die Juden verstockten sich mit diesem Spruch Ezechiel's getrost und wollen gewiß sein ihres Sinnes (ich wollte sagen Wahnsinnes); die laß fahren.“<sup>7)</sup> Diese altkirchliche Auslegung vom Messias wird unter den Neueren ganz entschieden von Kließoth vertreten, der zu unserer Stelle nach einer längeren Ausführung sagt: „Demnach werden wir unter dem Knecht David weder den wieder aufgeweckten Sohn Isaäc noch den Serubabel noch die davidische Dynastic noch irgendeinen beliebigen Davididen noch den in Christo nur gipfelnden Stamm, sondern ganz allein den einen, diejenige Person zu verstehen haben, welche Israels Volk, Matth. 12, 23, für den Verheißenen erlammte, als es zu den Worten, die es ihn reden hörte, und zu den Zeichen, die es ihn tun sah, seine davidische Abstammung hinzunahm.“<sup>8)</sup> Und Hengstenberg, der in seiner „Christiologie des Alten Testaments“ vom Jahre 1855<sup>9)</sup> nicht weiter gelommen war, als daß er in seiner verallgemeinernden Auslegungsweise sagte: „Man kann hier flüglich unter David den in Christo nur gipfelnden davidischen Stamm verstehen, so daß die Erfüllung in Christo nicht die einzige, sondern die höchste, die wahrhaftige ist“, sagte doch in seinen „Weissagungen des Propheten Ezechiel“ vom Jahre 1867 besser und entschiedener: „Dß durch David hier der wahrhaftige David, der Messias, bezeichnet wird, in dem der Stamm Davids gipfeln soll, daran läßt die entfaltetere Verlündung bei den früheren Propheten, z. B. Jes. 9 und 11, und in andern Stellen des Propheten selbst nicht zweifeln. An ein persönliches Wiedererscheinen Davids konnte niemand denken, der auf dem Gebiete der Schrift einheimisch war, ebensowenig wie in Mal. 3, 23 an ein persönliches Wiedererscheinen des Elias. Der Messias, der herrliche Nachkommne Davids, das war in der Zeit des Propheten schon längst Katechismuslehre. Es ist auch nicht von einer Wiedererweckung Davids die Rede, sondern von der Sendung eines David, welcher noch nicht dagewesen.“<sup>10)</sup> Der Messias wird aber ein „einiger Hirte“ genannt; das heißt, nicht einzig in seiner Art, unicus, singularis, sondern eben ein Hirte im Gegensatz zu den vielen schlechten Hirten, V. 2—10, und weil er die beiden getrennten Reiche Israel und Juda vereint wei-

7) III, 1913. 1914.

8) Das Buch Ezechiel, S. 326.

9) Zweite Ausgabe, 2, 573.

10) Zweiter Teil, S. 107.

den soll. Vgl. Kap. 37, 22, 24; Jer. 23, 6; Joh. 10, 16: „Und wird eine Herde und ein Hirte werden.“ Diesen einen Hirten nennt Jehovah seinen **Knecht**, eine besonders im zweiten Teil des Jesaja häufige Bezeichnung des Messias, Kap. 42, 1; 49, 6; 52, 18. Er heißt Knecht Jehovahs, weil er zu Jehovah in einem einzigartigen Verhältnis steht und weil Jehovah ihn ausgesondert und erwählt hat und er nun Jehovahs Willen tut. Er weidet Jehovahs Herde. Das **ny**, er „soll ihr Hirte sein“, zeigt die Bestimmung an, das **ny**, er „wird sie weiden“, die Verwirklichung dieser Bestimmung. Im 24. Vers wird dann noch besonders herborgehoben, daß gerade durch das Regiment dieses Hirten Jehovah in Wahrheit seines Volkes Gott wird.<sup>11)</sup> Denn dieser Davidsohn wird die Herde weiden in vollkommener Einheit mit Jehovah, wird nur den Willen Jehovahs ausführen. Das tut er, weil er eben eines Wesens und Willens mit Jehovah ist, weil er selbst Jehovah ist. In ihm wohnt Jehovah selbst unter seinem Volke. Was der Hirte tut, das tut Jehovah selbst. V. 11 heißt es: „Ich, der Herr **Herr**, will mich meiner Herde selbst annehmen“, und V. 23 heißt es: „Der wird sie weiden und soll ihr Hirte sein.“ Vgl. Joel 2, 23, 27. Ist aber dieser Hirte der Messias, so muß auch die Herde messianisch verstanden werden. Nicht das leibliche Israel ist gemeint, die beiden getrennten und exilierten Reiche, und seine Rückkehr aus dem Exil, sondern das geistliche Israel, die Kirche des Neuen Testaments, die eben durch Christum aus Juden und Heiden gesammelt wird, die Vollzahl der Außerwählten. Deshalb heißt es auch V. 31 ganz allgemein, nachdem V. 30 das Haus Israel genannt war: „Ja, ihr Menschen sollt die Herde meiner Weide sein, und ich will euer Gott sein, spricht der Herr **Herr**.“ Die Weide ist darum nichts anderes als die geistliche Weide, das Wort des Evangeliums, Ps. 23, 2. Und dies ist alles wahr und gewiß: „das sage ich, der **Herr**; „ich, Jehovah, habe es geredet“, Jehovah, der treue Bundesgott, der sein Wort hält und wahr machen wird.

Diese Auslegung unserer Stelle wird gewaltig bestätigt durch das Neue Testament. Es sei nur an die folgenden Stellen erinnert. Luk. 19, 10: „Des Menschen Sohn ist kommen, zu suchen und selig zu machen, was verloren ist.“ Matth. 18, 11. Luk. 15 lesen wir dann die Gleichnisse vom verlorenen Schaf, vom verlorenen Groschen und vom verlorenen Sohn. Besonders wird Joh. 10, 12—16 der gute Hirte dargestellt, und Jesus selbst bezeichnet sich als diesen guten Hirten. 1 Petr. 2, 25 heißt es: „Ihr seid nun bekehret zu dem Hirten und Bischof eurer Seelen.“ Und der Hebräerbrieft, diese „ausblüdige, feine Epistel, die vom Priestertum Christi meisterlich und gründlich aus der Schrift redet, dazu das alte Testament sein und reichlich auslegt“<sup>12)</sup> schließt mit dem Segenswunsch: „Gott aber des Friedens, der von den Toten ausgeführt hat

11) Auch hier ist wieder des Nachdrucks wegen das Pronomen zweimal besonders gesetzt.

12) Luther, XIV, 127.

den großen Hirten der Schafe durch das Blut des ewigen Testaments, unsern Herrn Jesum, der mache euch fertig in allem guten Werk, zu tun seinen Willen, und schaffe in euch, was vor ihm gefällig ist, durch Jesum Christum, welchem sei Ehre von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit!"

— • — L. Fürbringer

### Romanism, Calvinism, and Lutheranism on the Authority of Scripture

The desire for a large Pan-Protestant union has endeavored to minimize the theological differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism. True, Luther and Calvin had many things in common, e.g., the rejection of Pelagianism and the Roman hierarchical system. But only too often the divergent conceptions of sin and grace, of faith and works, of atonement and justification, of repentance and sanctification, are viewed only as minor differences. P. Tschackert: "*In der Hitze des theologischen Streites [Lutheranism vs. Calvinism] hatte man den Nachdruck auf das Trennende gelegt und das Gemeinsame zuruecktreten lassen. . . . Es gibt aber eine alle Unterschiede ueberragende geistige Einheit des Protestantismus.*" (*Entstehung der luth. u. ref. Kirchenlehre*, 626. Cf. also Klotzsche, *Chr. Symb.*, 194.) Admittedly the starting-point of Calvin's theological system is his theory concerning the absolute sovereignty of God. B. B. Warfield (*Studies in Theology*, 132) and L. Boettner (*Doctrine of Predestination*, 1. 2. 15) claim that also Luther put the doctrine of predestination into the center of his theology. But there is a fundamental difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism; the one excludes the other. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is by no means the only divisive factor between the two churches. Wherever the two systems have met, there has been bitter warfare, not merely in one or the other doctrine, but in principle, in spirit. Yes, we can go even a step farther — many of the doctrines and principles which separate Calvinism from Lutheranism are very closely related to Romanism. Outwardly, especially in the cultus and in church government, there is a marked dissimilarity between the Roman and Calvinistic churches. But in a number of fundamental doctrines Calvinism has remained very close to Romanism.<sup>1)</sup>

1) Professor Koehler: "Alle die Eigentümlichkeiten, die Calvin von Luther unterscheiden, stehen in organischem Zusammenhange zueinander und sind nach evangelischem Urteil dem Katholizismus näher verwandt als dem Luthertum. . . . Er hat mit Rom die Gesetzlichkeit, die Äußerlichkeit, die Vermischung von Staat und Kirche gemein. Das Luthertum ist nicht etwa ein Mittglied zwischen Rom und Calvinismus, sondern eine von beiden durchaus verschiedene Auffassung vom Weg zur Seligkeit." (*Kirchengeschichte*, 192. Cf. C. T. M., IV, 255 ff.; Raum, "Church Discipline of Luther and Calvin," *Lutheran Ch. Quart.*, 1933, January; W. Walther, *Lehrb. d. Symb.*, 282 f.)

Our topic is not an academic question, but one of practical significance to the Lutheran minister. 1) This is an age of religious indifference. Comparative Symbolics is viewed by many as the theological discipline which should bring out the consensus, rather than the dissensus, among the various churches. The late Soederblom: "The pure light of the divine truth is refracted and appears in the divisions of Christ's Church in many colors, which are unlike one another. . . . They are all needed to form the pure and perfect light." (*Christian Fellowship*, 26.) All who are indifferent over against the Calvinistic leaven should take to heart Selnecker's words: "*Der Zwinglianismus und Calvinismus stecket so voller Irrtum, Greuel und Laesterung in gar vielen, wo nicht in allen, Hauptpunkten des christlichen Glaubens, dass ein gottesfuerchtig Herz dafuer erschrecken muss.*" (*Appendix zu Hutters "Calvinista,"* 1615, p. 300.) 2) The potential mission-material of the modern pastor — whether it at one time belonged to a sectarian church or not — has to some extent come under the influence of Calvin's theological system. Calvinism has affected the thought-life of the American people to a greater extent than is commonly admitted.<sup>2)</sup> The Lutheran pastor should be acquainted with the viewpoints of the people whom he hopes to win for Christ. The purpose of this article, then, is to show the wide cleavage between Lutheranism on the one hand and Romanism and Calvinism on the other.

### I.

*Both the Papacy and Calvinism are enthusiastic<sup>3)</sup> and rationalistic, while the formal principle of Lutheranism is sola Scriptura.*

2) Ph. Schaff: "Calvin belongs to the small number of men who have exerted a molding influence . . . not only upon the Church, but indirectly also upon the political, moral, and social life. . . . He may be called in some sense the spiritual father of New England and the American Republic. Calvinism, in its various modifications and applications, was the controlling agent in the early history of our leading colonies." (*Creeds of Christendom*, I, 445, n.) Tschackert: "Der Hauptinhalt seiner [Calvins] gesamten Theologie ist in seiner 'Institutio' niedergelegt. Einzigartig in der Reformationsgeschichte durch ihre innere Kraft, hat sie auf Jahrhunderte das theologische Denken der reformierten Kirche beherrscht und uebt ihren Einfluss noch heute aus." (L. c., 390.) Carl Zollmann, in *American Church Law*, shows that "Christianity has been declared to be the power which directs the operation of our judicial system" and that "the spirit of Christianity has infused itself into, and has humanized, our law." (Quoted in C. T. M., IV, 251.) Consult *Webster's Dictionary* s. v. *faith, hope, reprobation, etc.*, showing Calvinistic influence on the English language.

3) Enthusiasm (ἐνθεός) is the state where one is possessed of his god and has become the tool and mouthpiece of the supposed deity. Lutheran dogmaticians use this term to describe the dream "that God draws men without all means, without hearing the divine Word, and the like." (*Trigl.*, 910, § 80; 138, §§ 63, 64.) "Enthusiasm" and "enthusiastic" are used throughout this article in the sense of *Schwaermerei* and *schwaermersisch*.

1) Rome is *enthusiastic* and *rationalistic*. Lutherans say: *Sola Scriptura!* Rome retorts: *Sola Roma! Solus Papa! Roma locuta, causa finita.* Rome's enthusiasm is evident. The Smalcald Articles say: "The Papacy is nothing but sheer enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatsoever he decides and commands within his Church is spirit and right, even though it is above, and contrary to, Scripture and the spoken word." (*Trigl.*, 495, § 4.) In spite of the oft-repeated claim in recent years that they hold the Bible in high regard, the Romanists have not receded from their historic antagonism to the Word of God, but place their "traditions," i. e., their enthusiastic dreams, above the Bible. (Cf. *Popular Symbolics*, 1934, § 219.) In the final analysis not the Word of God, but the "traditions of the fathers," i. e., "doctrines of men," are the *formal principle* of Roman theology. Why do Romanists "hold the Bible in high regard"? Because it is the only norm of faith? Father Hull of the Paulist Press and Catholic Truth Society says: Catholics "regard the Bible as a treasure of unique value, first, because of the vivid pictures of Christ's life and character; secondly, because of the right spiritual suggestiveness of its writings; thirdly, as a precious storehouse of dogmatic and moral instruction; fourthly, as an historic witness of the claims of the Catholic Church. Still Catholics consider that the Bible was never intended for the sole and adequate rule of faith, partly because it was not a sufficiently exhaustive account of all of Christ's teaching, partly because its expressions of doctrine are often ambiguous and require authoritative interpretation." (Weber, *Religions and Philosophies in the U. S.*, p. 57.) In the interest of its formal principle Rome has perverted the doctrine of the Church, teaching that the *essence* of the Church is the *teaching office*. Wilmers: "Christ founded the Church by creating an office and authority." (*Kurzgefasstes Handbuch d. kath. Rel.*, 83. 89.) Father Hull: "The Church's essential constitution [italics our own] lay in the existence of that teaching body authorized and guaranteed by Christ. . . . And it is natural to suppose that the Church should always continue to exist according to its original constitution." (Weber, l. c., 59.) The teaching office had been considered infallible long before 1870. Appealing to 1 Tim. 5, 16, the Douay Bible in its footnotes claims that the Church of the living God, i. e., the teaching office, "can never uphold error nor bring corruption, superstition, or idolatry." Although Rome claimed infallibility for the "teaching office," it was only too apparent that councils had erred. Rome also feared that a minority of bishops might "apprehend the truth more correctly" than a majority, and therefore the voice of the teaching office is now confined to the Pope.

This coarse enthusiasm is defended by Roman apologetes by the enthusiastic assertion that the Holy Spirit never intended the New Testament to be the norm of faith and morals, that Christ Himself did not write, and that He sent His apostles to *preach*, not to write. Bellarmine (1542—1620) states that the New Testament epistles were written to meet certain local conditions. Andrade, the official interpreter of the decrees of the Council of Trent, stated that the New Testament books were only "notes" to aid the apostles' memory. On the basis of Jer. 31, 33 he argues that the chief difference between the Old and New Testaments consists in this, that the Old was written on stone and paper while the New was written almost entirely into the heart of the Church, *i. e.*, the teaching office. The Council of Trent definitely fixed Roman doctrine by decreeing: "The truth and the discipline are contained in the written books and the *unwritten traditions*." (Sess. IV.)<sup>4)</sup> This is indeed "sheer enthusiasm."

Rome, however, is enthusiastic even when it uses the Scripture. The Pope approaches the Bible with preconceived notions, and he has employed every possible safeguard, so that "no one shall presume to interpret the Scriptures contrary to that sense which Holy Mother Church — whose it is to judge the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures — hath held and doth hold." (Council of Trent, Sess. IV.) In the eyes of the Romanist the Bible is a lump of modeling-clay, "*eine waechserne Nase*," as Chemnitz says. A Catholic professor of interpretation must repeatedly take a solemn vow that he will explain the Bible only in the sense of the Church, *i. e.*, the Pope, and the laity is permitted to read only such editions of the Vulgate as have been approved. The footnotes in the Douay Version (1582—1609) are the papistically darkened glasses through which the papists are permitted to read God's

4) The traditions are "unwritten" so far as they were not written by the apostles. By traditions the Romanists understand the records of the church councils, any suitable inscription, the sentences of the "fathers," private letters, etc. E. Preuss, *Die Unbefleckte Empfaengnis*, shows that forged letters and documents advocating the doctrine of Mary's immaculate conception were planted in an unfrequented cloister and then "accidentally found" (84 ff.). Thus any error can finally be elevated from a *pia sententia* to an official doctrine, *e. g.*, the assumption of Mary, when sufficient traditions have been found in support of the error. Of course, the Pope will await the proper moment; for "the policy of the Church is to be cautious and slow in taking novel views, such as tend to shock and alarm the simple-minded, until such views have been firmly established by evidence." (Father Hull, *l. c.*, 60.) How unreliable the bases are on which the infallibility of the Pope is builded is proved by Janus, *Der Papst und das Konzil*, 1869, *passim*. The so-called "decrets of Isidore," about 845, are proved to be spurious, pp. 100 ff. The classic on this entire topic still is Chemnitz's *Examen Trid. Conc.*, Preuss ed., Berlin, 1861, pp. 1—99. This locus was translated into German by C. A. Frank, St. Louis, 1875.

Word.<sup>5)</sup> That is "sheer enthusiasm." It is largely the enthusiastic spirit which has prompted Rome to recognize only the Vulgate, inclusive of the Apocryphal Books. This enthusiastic device is necessary to maintain the superstitious belief concerning Mary (Gen. 3, 17), the doctrine that matrimony is a sacrament (Eph. 5, 32), the arrogant assumption of withholding the cup from the laity (1 Cor. 4, 1: *Dispensatores sumus*), the expiatory power of good works (Tob. 4, 11 f.), the intercession of the angels and saints (Tob. 12, 12), the intercessory prayers for the dead (2 Macc. 12, 44 ff.), etc. No wonder, then, that Cardinal Newman claims that the unauthorized Protestant Bibles are the stronghold of heresy. (See Froude, *Council of Trent*, 56.)

Rome's enthusiasm manifests itself also in the doctrine of the means of grace. Rome refuses to recognize the Word as a *means* of grace. According to Trent only the Sacraments are the vehicles of grace, "through which all true justice either begins or, being begun, is increased or, being lost, is repaired." (Sess. VII.) This evidently denies the collative and effective power to the *Word*. In Roman text-books of dogmatics and in the popular catechisms the Gospel is not treated among the means of grace. Melanchthon reminds his readers in the *Apology* that in many countries there was no preaching whatsoever except during Lent. (Trigl., 326, 42.) The Council of Trent yielded to the demand for sermons by instructing the bishops to make provisions for preaching services. (Sess. XXIV, chap. IV.) But to the present day the faithful are under *obligation* to attend the Mass, while they are only *encouraged* to attend the preaching services. (Cf. W. Walther, *Symbolik*, 90.) If Rome considered the Word a means of grace, it would surely have rescinded the infamous bull *Unigenitus* (1713), which was directed against the Jansenist father Quesnel and expressly condemned the proposition that the reading of the Bible must be free to all. The unrestricted reading of the Bible is still considered a dangerous practise. (Wilmers, I, 212. Cf. *Pop. Symb.*, 154 ff.) Neither does Rome consider the Sacraments means of grace. Rome does not accept the Scriptural definition of the word *grace* as the

5) The Douay Version comments on Rom. 3, 28 as follows: Only the faith which embraces hope, love, repentance, and the use of the Sacraments will save. The works which are excluded from justification are the works done according to the law of nature or that of Moses. The pontifical Confutation (the Romanists' answer to the Augustana, reprinted in Luther, St. Louis, XVI, 1026 ff.) is a fair sample of Rome's misuse of the Scriptures. Melanchthon's *Apology* takes occasion to answer Rome's allegorical and enthusiastic misuse of God's Word. A good sample of Rome's exegetical methods was quoted in *Harper's Magazine*, May, 1933, p. 426: the parable of the Sower is made to teach that wedlock brings fruit thirtyfold, but maidenhood an hundredfold. "By how many degrees does the marrying maiden fall downward?"

favor of God, but defines it as a quality, a virtue, which is infused into man whereby he is able to do good and justify himself. The Sacraments are said to convey this "justifying grace" *ex opere operato*, "without a good disposition on the part of the one using it, i. e., without faith in Christ." (*Trigl.*, 259, 25; 312, 18.) This is all "sheer enthusiasm."

Enthusiasm engenders *rationalism*, and *vice versa*. The Pope shows his rationalistic tendencies not only by the scholastic arguments in support of enthusiastic doctrines,<sup>6)</sup> but chiefly by developing a theological system that appeals to human reason. The material principle of Roman theology, the doctrine of work-righteousness, "is a doctrine of reason; . . . and because it is according to reason and is altogether occupied with outward works, can be understood." (*Apology*, *Trigl.*, 203, 167 f.) Reason cannot comprehend the depth of human corruption (cf. *Smalc. Art.*; *Trigl.*, 476, 3), but it can understand Rome's attempt to view sin as individual transgressions and its philosophical distinction between venial and mortal sins. It can comprehend Rome's teaching that God looks upon an individual sin as merely an infraction of a particular commandment and not a transgression of the whole Law and that in the case of mortal sins a satisfaction, or punishment, commensurate with the transgression must be imposed. Human reason is highly flattered by Rome's doctrine that man is able to render a satisfactory atonement for the individual sins. Even the dream of purgatory is not repulsive to the reason of natural man. It seems "reasonable" to believe that God will give man an opportunity after death to atone for his sins, and therefore we need not be surprised that we find the doctrine of purgatory in its essential phases in the writings of pagan philosophers, particularly Plato. (Cf. *Chemnitz*, *l. c.*, 603 f.) Rome's system is rationalistic, that is, pagan. (W. Walther, *l. c.*, 166 ff.) — Fully recognizing the enthusiastic and rationalistic tendencies of Rome, Luther said in his farewell words at *Smalcald*, when he was at the point of death: "*Deus vos impleat odio papae!*" And in the *Smalcald Articles* he had written: "Just as little as we can worship the devil as Lord and God, can we endure his apostle, the Pope. For to lie and to kill and to destroy body and soul eternally, that is wherein his papal government really consists." (*Trigl.*, 475, § 14. Cf. also *Luther*, *St. L.*, *XIX*, 1247.)

6) To convince the people that Mary is worthy of the highest honors, the sermons on the festival of Mary's Assumption usually portray how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost gave Mary one half of their combined glory, so that she now possesses more glory (one half) than the individual persons in the Trinity (one-sixth). (W. Walther, *l. c.*, 126. *Pop. Symb.*, Index, *s. v.* Rationalism.)

2) Reformed theology claims that it is more consistent in its Biblical interpretation and more loyal to Scripture than Lutheranism. Calvin states: "Nothing ought to be admitted in the Church as the Word of God but what is contained in the writings of the prophets and apostles . . . and that it behooves ministers strictly to adhere to the doctrine to which God has made all subject." (*Institutes*, IV, VIII, 8. 9.) Calvin stated on his death-bed that he never knowingly twisted a single passage of Scripture. He is indeed considered an outstanding exegete (cf. C. T. M., IV, 257; Hengstenberg, *Christol. d. a. T.*, quotes him very often); the Calvinistic confessions express their high regard for the Scriptures; yet Calvinistic theology is largely enthusiastic and rationalistic. In this point Calvinism manifests a marked similarity to Rome, while it differs fundamentally from Lutheranism. (Pieper, *Dogm.*, I, 25; III, 373; Philippi, *Symb.*, 418.)

Rome's enthusiasm manifests itself in the dogma that the "teaching office" fixes the Scriptural canon. Calvin vigorously condemns Rome's claim that the Scriptures must be accepted on human authority. (*Institutes*, I, VII, 1.) Paradoxical as it may appear, Calvin virtually makes the same enthusiastic claim as Rome by assigning to an "inner spirit" the office of fixing the sacred canon. In Rome the Bible is accepted as God's Word by authority of the "Church," in Geneva by the individual believer's subjective conviction.

True, Calvin states that the Bible must be accepted solely because the Spirit testifies to its truth. "Only in the Scriptures has the Lord been pleased to preserve His truth. . . . The same Spirit who spake by the mouths of the prophets should penetrate into our hearts to convince us that they faithfully delivered the oracles which were divinely entrusted to them." (*Institutes*, I, IX, 1.) According to Calvin the "testimony of the Spirit" confirms the divine character of the Bible in all its parts. On the basis of 1 Cor. 2, 4. 5 a Lutheran would at once subscribe to Calvin's statement if it were not apparent that Calvin's "testimony of the Spirit" is a subjective conviction wrought *immediate*. Like Zwingli (cf. *Fidei Ratio*; Luther, St. Louis, XX, 1557) Calvin distinguishes between an external and an inner word. (Cf. *Institutes*, III, XXI, 7; III, XXIV, 8.) He admonishes us to hear the minister, but adds the significant statement "as a proof of our obedience. . . . The power of God is not confined to external means." (IV, I, 5.) Again: "The Word does not impart any benefit unless it is accompanied by the Holy Spirit to open our mind and heart and render us capable of receiving its testimony." (IV, XIV, 17.) Thus Calvin's "testimony of the Spirit" is not the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* wrought through the very words of Scripture and through it alone

(cf. Pieper, *Dogm.*, I, 372 ff.), but it is a subjective feeling that the Bible is God's Word. On the basis of this it seems that the following statement of Calvin does not contain Scripture truth, but enthusiasm: "The Word will never gain credit in the hearts of men till it be confirmed by the internal testimony of the Spirit. It is necessary that the same Spirit who spake by the prophets should penetrate into our hearts. . . . They who have been inwardly taught by the Spirit feel an entire acquiescence in the Scriptures. . . . It is such a persuasion as cannot be produced but by a revelation from heaven." (*Institutes*, I, IX, 1.) Thus it follows that the Calvinist like the Romanist accepts the Bible as God's Word on human authority. And that is "sheer enthusiasm."<sup>7)</sup>

Calvin's enthusiasm (*Schwaermerei*) is evident furthermore in his approach to, and use of, the Scriptures. Like Rome he approaches the Bible with preconceived notions. It is quite apparent from the *Institutes* that the doctrine of justification was not Calvin's material principle. On the contrary, we meet with a one-sided emphasis of the doctrine that everything must be done for the glorification of God. The *Geneva Catechism*, published by Calvin in 1545, treats the chief parts from the basic conception that it is man's duty throughout his life to glorify God. In the *Institutes* Calvin's basic principle becomes evident particularly in the treatise on the Church, which comprises about one half of the entire *Institutes*. According to Calvin the outstanding function of the ministry is to interpret the will of God in such a manner that the glory of God will be reflected in the lives of men. (IV, I, 5.) In order that the laws and commandments of the Bible may be fulfilled by men to the glory of God (II, VIII, 51), Calvin demands of men that they "honor the Church" (IV, I, 7), obey the ruling officers (IV, III, 3), and accept the interpretation of the pastors (4). His theocratic form of church government in Geneva manifests clearly that he approached the Bible with the thought that all of its injunction must be fulfilled literally. Calvin does not admit

7) Tschackert states very correctly: "Im Gegensatz zur katholischen Anschauung, dass die Bibel ihre Autoritaet erst der Kirche verdanke, lehrt Calvin ein UNMITTELBARES inneres goettliches Zeugnis, welches uns eine ueber alle menschlichen Schluesse erhabene Gewissheit von der Autoritaet der Heiligen Schrift gibt." (*Entstehung d. luth. u. ref. Kirchenlehre*, 391.) — The Barthians, moderate Calvinists, are more consistent than Calvin. They believe that "the Word of the Bible is the Word of God to us only in so far as God's Spirit opens our ears, so that we can hear His voice in the words of the apostles." (E. Brunner, *The Word and the World*, 89.) The Barthian believes that only that message is the infallible Word which the Holy Spirit brings home to the believer. This leads to "vast subjectivity, in which each man decides for himself just what portion of Scripture has authority for him." (Rolston, *A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner*, 1933, 70—101.)

a real difference between the Old and the New Testament; there is, so he claims, a difference as to administration, but not as to the content. (II, X, 2.) He does not believe that the Mosaic Law has been fully abrogated, but that only its power of binding the consciences has been removed by Christ. (II, VII, 15.) Somehow the Ceremonial Law, e. g., Deut. 22, 5, must be observed also in the New Testament, the "Second" and the "Fourth" Commandment must be kept by Christians today, and the injunctions concerning the punishment of heretics must be fulfilled literally today, etc.<sup>8)</sup> Approaching the Bible with such preconceived notions, more specifically with a deep-seated legalistic attitude, is "sheer enthusiasm," *Schwaermerei*. Rome places the traditions of the Fathers above Scripture; Calvin, his literalistic interpretations. In Rome the Pontiff usurps the power to expound the Bible and to give minute instructions concerning "faith and morals"; in Geneva the Roman Pontiff has been supplanted by a "paper pope."<sup>9)</sup>

Rome's error that the Sacraments are efficacious *ex opere operato* and the concomitant error that the Gospel does not convey the divine "grace" deny the Scriptural truth that the Gospel and the Sacraments are means of *grace*. Calvin condemns both errors and admonishes men to use the Word diligently and to approach the Sacraments in faith. Nevertheless he also denies that the Word and the Sacraments are the *means* of grace. (Cf. *Popular Symbolics*, p. 4.) True, he states that preaching is the ordinary economy which God employs in converting man (IV, XVI, 19); further-

8) The literalistic interpretation of the Bible by Calvin is treated by W. Walther, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*, 217. 224. 277; G. Harkness, *Calvin, the Man and His Ethic*, 1931, pp. 63—65; Nik. Paulus, *Protestantismus und Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert*, 1911, pp. 228—275. Rudelbach, in *Reformation, Luthertum und Union*, pp. 205 ff., shows that Calvin makes no distinction between the Old and the New Testament by quoting Calvin to the effect that Baptism has taken the place of Circumcision, that the Lord's Supper has been instituted in the place of the Passover, etc.—Literalism is largely responsible for the division in the Reformed Church, one group holding that the episcopal, another, that the congregational, and another, that the presbyterian form of government belongs to the *esse* of the Church. Literalism is very largely responsible for the legalistic attitude which the majority of Reformed churches have taken concerning the Sabbath, tithing, the cultus, etc., or for the ludicrous interpretations of many Scripture-passages in the interest of a millennium. A literalistic interpretation of Matt. 10, 27 prompted the people of Zurich to preach from the roofs; of Acts 2, 46 motivates the Plymouth Brethren never to celebrate the Lord's Supper in a church; of Matt. 19, 21 moves the Metropolitan Church Association to forbid its ministers to accept a regular salary.

9) "For the Roman imperialism Calvin simply substitutes a Scriptural imperialism. The Bible Church is the ultimate and final authority over the regenerate man. . . . This is simply Roman Catholicism without the name Roman." (T. C. Hall, *History of Ethics within Organized Christianity*, 1910, 519 f.)

more, that the authoritative preaching office, or the Church, the Sacraments, and the civil government have been appointed by God as external means of grace or aids. (IV, I, 1.) But he does not wish to be understood as though he taught that the Word and the Sacraments are the appointed means whereby (*per*) the Holy Spirit is given. That Calvin entertains the Zwinglian view concerning the Word and the Sacraments is evident from two Calvinian premises. 1) The error of a double election compels Calvin to separate the Spirit from the outward Word. Calvin makes a definite distinction between the Word when preached to the reprobate, *i. e.*, "the external call without the internal efficacy of grace" (III, XXI, 7), and "the special call, . . . when, by the inward illumination of His Spirit, God causes the Word to sink into their [the elects'] heart." (III, XXIV, 8.) Again: "When the apostle makes hearing the source of faith, he only describes the ordinary economy, . . . but does not preclude His [God's] employment of any other method, which He has certainly employed in the calling of many to whom He has given the true knowledge of Himself in an internal manner, by the illumination of His Spirit without the intervention of any preaching." (IV, XVI, 19.) 2) A definite trend of mysticism and asceticism is noticeable in Calvin's theology. He does not believe that a direct relation between the corporeal and the spiritual, between the finite and the infinite, between the human and the divine, is possible. This view becomes apparent not only in his denial of the personal union of Christ, not only in his ascetic views concerning our bodies, our entire life, the Christians' temporal possession, but also in his denial of the Scriptural doctrine concerning the means of grace. According to Calvin the Spirit of God cannot work upon our spirits through creatures; the deep chasm between the infinite God and finite man cannot be bridged by means. Joachim Westphal was correct when he showed clearly during the Crypto-Calvinistic controversy that in spite of his Melanchthonian terminology Calvin was not a Lutheran, but a Zwinglian in the doctrine of the Sacraments. (Cf. *Trigl.*, Hist. Introd., 181.) When Calvin speaks of the Sacraments as signs or pledges of God's grace, he does not think of them as the "visible Word," but as the "seal of a diploma," as aids which God has appointed in compassion on our weakness. According to Calvin the Word, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper are not the means through which faith is engendered, "as though there were a secret power annexed and attached to the Sacraments, . . . whereas the only office assigned to them by God is to testify and confirm His benevolence towards us." The Word and the Sacraments do not create faith, but presuppose faith, "just as the mouth of the vessel must be open if it is to receive the oil." The majestic God does not

require external means; "for God accomplishes within that which the minister represents by the external act that we may not attribute to a mortal man what God challenges exclusively for Himself." (IV, XIV, 9—11. 17.) When Calvin speaks of the Sacraments as the "visible Word," he has in mind a twofold function, namely, that they seal by an outward sign God's benevolence toward us which is already in our conscience and that they are the visible evidence and public testimony of the believer's piety. (IV, XIV, 1.) There is not a word in Calvin's *Institutes* which can be interpreted as teaching that the Sacraments have collative and effective power. Calvin predicates the institution of Sacraments on the fact that man finds it difficult to understand spiritual things and that "God therefore accommodates Himself to our capacity, condescending to lead us to Himself even by these earthly elements and in the flesh itself presents to us a mirror of spiritual blessings." (IV, XIV, 3.) And this, too, is "sheer enthusiasm." Thus both Rome and Calvinism stand charged with enthusiasm.

Rationalism and enthusiasm go hand in hand. Human reason has painted the Calvinistic picture of God's decreeing the reprobation of one part of mankind; has invented the anti-Scriptural doctrine of irresistible grace and a limited atonement; has denied the personal union of Christ; has developed an anthropology and cosmology which is foreign to the Bible. (Cf. Pieper, *Chr. Dogm.*, III, 377.) Human reason speaks the final word in Calvinism. We find the same situation in Roman theology.

The results of enthusiasm and rationalism are evident in both churches. Enthusiasm develops a theology of doubt. Rome teaches that no one can be certain of his "justification" and of his preservation in faith (unless he has had a special revelation). (*Trid. Conc.*, Sess. VI, chap. IX, and Canons XV, XVI.) Calvinism bases the assurance of salvation on a subjective feeling which finds expression in the Calvinistic axiom "Once in grace, always in grace." Thus neither Rome nor Calvinism has an objective foundation upon which the believer's faith can rest securely. Rationalism leads to work-righteousness, to unionism, to unbelief. And we can find these results in some form both in Romanism and in Calvinism.

3) Wherever Lutheran Scriptural theology has met Catholicism or Calvinism, there has been bitter warfare. The absolute and final authority of the Holy Scriptures was the focal point of Luther's controversy with Rome. That was the trumpet-blast in his first skirmish with Rome when he declared on October 31, 1517: "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ says." *Sola Scriptura* was the battering-ram which he used in storming the "three walls" of Roman theology. (*An den christlichen Adel*, in 1520.) "Thus it is written," this was the firm ground on which he stood

in the controversy with the Sacramentarians. The difference between Luther and Zwinglians centered not in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but in their attitude over against the Bible. Although the doctrine of the absolute authority of the Scripture was the focal point of Luther's controversies with Romanists and Sacramentarians, yet the Lutheran Confessions do not contain an article which treats this doctrine *ex professo*. This need not disturb us; for "*sola Scriptura*" is like the *motif* of a symphony which recurs in many and beautiful variations throughout the Symbolical Books. "The Scriptures alone" is the formal principle of the Lutheran Church and was duly emphasized by the noble confessors at Augsburg over against Romanists and Enthusiasts down to the authors of, and subscribers to, the Formula of Concord over against the Crypto-Romanists and Crypto-Calvinists. When the Romanists make their preposterous claim that the Pope, the bishops, and the church councils establish doctrines, we answer with our Confessions: "The Holy Scriptures alone remain the only judge, rule, and standard according to which, as the only touchstone, all dogmas shall and must be discerned." (*Trigl.*, 778, 7; cf. 776, 1; 467, 15; 38, 8.) "I shall not deviate one finger's breadth from the mouth of Him who said, 'This is My beloved Son; hear ye Him,'" thus we silence the rationalizations of Anabaptists, Zwinglians, Schwenkfeldians, Calvinists, etc. True, also the Lutheran's reason wishes to assert itself. But we bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of God's Word, because "everything for which we have . . . certain, clear testimonies in the Scriptures we must simply believe and in no way argue against it." (*Trigl.*, 1033, 53; cf. also 476, 3; 490, 41.) This attitude towards God's revealed Word is manifest particularly in the Formula of Concord, VII. (*Trigl.*, 988, 50; 1008, 106.) Lutherans do not feel called upon to harmonize seeming contradictions in Scripture, but believe, confess, defend, and adhere to, the teachings of the Bible. (*Trigl.*, 1078, 52 ff.) They consider the mysteries of God's Word as opportunities to exercise their faith. (Luther, *St. L.*, XVIII, 1716.)<sup>10)</sup>

Rome denies the *vis effectiva* of the Word, believing that the Sacraments are efficacious *ex opere operato*; the Sacramentarians deny that the Spirit works either through the Word or the Sacraments. The Lutheran Confessions declare again and again that

10) Luther was assailed by fierce doubts in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and writes: "*Das bekenne ich, wo Dr. Carlstadt oder jemand anders vor fuenf Jahren mich haette moecht' berichten, dass im Sakrament nichts denn Brot und Wein waere, der haette mir einen grossen Dienst getan. Ich habe wohl so harte Anfechtung da erlitten und MICH GERUNGEN UND GEZWUNGEN, dass ich gerne heraus waere. . . . Aber ich bin gefangen; der Text steht zu gewaltig da und will sich mit Worten nicht lassen aus dem Sinn reissen.*" (*St. L.*, XV, 2050.)

God will not give His Spirit except through the Word, i. e., through the Gospel and the Sacraments, or the "visible" Word. (Cf. *Trigl.*, 494, 4; 606, 91; 732, 7. 8; 1084, 71; etc.) Word and Sacraments are the means whereby both the soul and the body are saved; for whenever the soul is saved, there the body, too, which can and does apprehend the elements, will live forever. (*Trigl.*, 742, 44 ff.; 768, 68. Luther's Works, St. L., XX, 831.)

Rome and Calvin approach the Scriptures with a material principle which is not found in the Scriptures, but which is superimposed on them. Because the Lutheran's formal principle is *sola Scriptura*, his material principle must be the doctrine of justification, *sola gratia*. This article permeates Scripture and therefore directs and controls all true theological thinking. Every teaching which is not brought into proper relation with the article of justification is *eo ipso* false. The true theological perspective can be maintained only if theology centers in justification.<sup>11)</sup> According to the Lutheran Confessions the Gospel is God's gracious revelation to man, offering, containing, conveying to, and working in, him the forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation. (*Trigl.*, 995, 62; 792, 6; etc.) Luther had been taught to read the Bible in such a manner as to find in the word *righteousness* nothing but his own righteousness, which must be procured through strict observance of his monastic order's regulations. At last the Holy Spirit removed these "Roman" glasses through the Gospel, and Luther learned that only *aliena iustitia* avails in the sight of God. "And now," says Luther (in the preface to the 1545 edition of his works), "I knew that I was born anew and that I had found a wide and open door to paradise itself. Now the dear Holy Scriptures appeared entirely differently to me." (St. L., XIV, 446 f.)

Springfield, Ill.

F. E. MAYER

### Sermon Study on 1 John 4, 9-11

Two facts must strike every careful reader of the First Epistle of John. The one is that, in appealing to his readers to practise Christian love, he is not satisfied with a bare demand, a simple exhortation. Each of the three admonitions (chap. 3, 9-11; 3, 10-18; 4, 7-5, 2), as they grow in length, is in increasing measure saturated with indoctrination in the fundamentals of the Christian faith, the doctrines of the Trinity, of the deity of Christ, of the vicarious atonement. Moreover, each one is preceded by, and the

11) Luther: "In meinem Herzen herrscht allein dieser Artikel, naemlich der Glaube an Christum, aus welchem, durch welchen und zu welchem bei Tag und bei Nacht alle meine theologischen Gedanken fliessen und zurueckfliessen." (St. L., IX, 8; Vorrede zum Galaterbrief.)

entire epistle closes with, rather lengthy discussions of these basic truths of the Christian religion. The other fact is that the apostle of love does not hesitate to make use of polemics, and unsparing polemics, against all denials and deniers of Christian doctrines. Read chap. 1, 6. 8. 10; 2, 18. 19. 22. 23. 26; 3, 7; 4, 1-6; 5, 10-12. 21. The three urgent exhortations to love are surrounded, enfolded, as it were, buttressed from within and without, by dogmatics and polemics. It is necessary to keep these two facts in mind especially in our day, when so many self-styled exponents of love and charity, who claim to follow in the footsteps of the apostle of love, positively and determinedly refuse to follow him in his insistence on clarity and purity of doctrine and in his use of polemics against every error and every errorist. Theirs is a charity, a love, which overlooks doctrinal differences as minor matters, which clamors for external union without internal unity of faith and doctrine, which is ready to shout with Schiller, *Seid umschlungen, Millionen! Diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt!*" at the same time being altogether unwilling to grant the kiss of brotherhood to such as have the audacity to stand up for purity of doctrine. Right there their charity, their love, comes to a sudden and abrupt end. Such love is *toto caelo* different from that of the apostle, as we shall see with increasing clarity in studying our text.

Our lesson is part of the third and longest exhortation to love, extending from chap. 4, 7 to chap. 5, 3. In order to understand fully the import of this lesson, it will be well that the pastor, before preaching on this text, read the entire letter, paying special attention to those passages where phrases and expressions very similar to those used in this text occur. See, e. g., chap. 2, 1-6.

In the opening words of chap. 4, 1-6 the apostle had warned against error and errorists and had pointed to the vast difference between the children of the world and the children of God, the followers of error and the disciples of truth. Beginning with v. 7, he exhorts his readers to practise true love. They are of God, v. 6, and for that reason they must be followers of God, not only in opposing error and false doctrine, but just as truly in loving their fellow-followers of the truth, their brethren in faith. In order to make this admonition the more urgent, he adds a threefold reason, v. 7: 1) Love is of God; 2) every one that loveth is born of God; 3) every one that loveth knoweth God. These three reasons are elaborated in chap. 4, 8-5, 3. The third reason is the first one taken up by the apostle. He proves, v. 8, that every one loving knows God, "for God is Love." If God is Love, then, naturally, every one that does not love shows by this very lack of love that he knows not God, who is Love. Conversely, every one that loves shows by that very love that he knows God, who is Love, and from that

knowledge of God and His love he has learned, and learns ever better, to love his brethren. Before taking up his first and second reason, the apostle goes on to prove his last statement, that God indeed is Love, by pointing to that marvelous manifestation of God's love in the sending of His own Son, v. 8. Thus he paves the way for the substantiation of the first two reasons, *viz.*, that love is of God, an outflow from that well-spring of divine love, vv. 10, 11, and that every one that loves is born of God, v. 12 to 5, 3. Throughout this entire passage John constantly reverts to, and unfolds, the thought that love and the lover owe their origin to the wondrous, unique, all-surpassing love of God, like an eagle soaring round and round about this central point and soaring ever higher and higher, without ever being able to scale the heights of this love which reaches to the very throne, the inmost heart, of Him whose being and whose love is beyond understanding.

After this brief survey let us study in detail the lesson for Jubilate Sunday. May our hearts and souls be filled with grateful jubilation and may our joy become manifest in our love toward God and the brethren!

V. 9: "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him."

The apostle briefly, but convincingly proves his statement that God is Love. The greatness of God's love is seen already in the very fact that He manifested it. God's love is not merely an emotional mood, an inactive sentiment, quiescent, hidden in His heart. It is a love *toward* us.

The apostle does not use the preposition *εἰς*, His love did not merely reach out in a general direction toward us, only to flee horrified and disgusted upon seeing nothing but unloveliness, wickedness, foulness, in mankind. No, thank God, His love is more than that. It is a love *ἐν*, *on* us, a love that in spite of our utter unworthiness not merely approached and dealt with us as from a distance, but, like a heavenly dove, lighted upon us and found on us its resting-place.

In various ways God showed that His love rested upon man. The creation of the world, its preservation and government, God's appearing to the patriarchs and prophets of old, His speaking to Israel at sundry times and in divers manners, all were manifestations of His love. For John there is one manifestation of God's love overshadowing all others: "He sent His only-begotten Son." His Son He sent, not a creature, not a man, not an angel, but Him of whom He had said: Ps. 2, 7; who was very God of very God, Col. 1, 15-17; 2, 3, 9; Heb. 1, 2, 3. "Only-begotten." Note the repetition of the article in the original, whereby "both substantive

and adjective receive emphasis and the adjective is added as a sort of climax in apposition with a separate article." (Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 776.) There is no other Son of God, but this one and only-begotten, the Son whom He loved with all the fulness of His divine love, John 3, 35; 5, 20. This Son God hath sent, ἀπέσταλκεν, the perfect "implying the present, permanent, continuing effect of the mission of the Son of God." (*The Bible Commentary*.) This Son He sent off not to some heavenly region, there to confer with angels and archangels; no, into the world. Mark the emphatic position of the words in the original, which is to call to our attention once more who the Sender is, the true and only God, and to effect a sharp contrast between the Sender and the place whither He sent His Son. Picture to yourself the holy and righteous God, of "purer eyes than to behold evil," and then think of this world of sin, and vice, and crime, and hatred, and blasphemy. Is that a place into which the loving Father would gladly send His own Son? This world, the habitation of sorrow and lamentations and tears and heart-aches and sickness and death, is that an appropriate destination for Him whose home had been in the bosom of His Father, where joy and happiness alone are found and sorrow and sadness are not known? Yet the Father was willing to send His own beloved Son from the sinless purity and griefless joy of His presence into the world of wickedness and woe. Why? His only motive was love, love that was concerned about mankind, that turned in complete unselfishness toward those creatures that had turned from their loving Creator, had in basest ingratitude found their delight in a life of sin and shame, had of their own volition chosen death rather than life. To this mankind He, the God of love and life, in love ineffable sent His only-begotten Son, Life of Life, in order that they "might live through Him." Cp. John 10, 10. The life which Christ was to procure for us was indeed a life worthy of the name; it was not a life of bondage to sin and servitude to Satan and fear of death and finally everlasting damnation. The Son procured for us a life which is of God, which is lived by the faith of the Son of God (Gal. 2, 20), which grows more and more into the likeness of Him who loved us unto death; a life that finds its delight in grateful and willing service of God and the fellow-men (Luke 1, 74, 75; Matt. 20, 25-28); the happy, contented life of the child of God, who knows Rom. 8, 28-39; a life which does not end with temporal death, which even in the face of death exclaims: Luke 2, 29 f.; 2 Tim. 4, 7, 8. This life we have through Him, διά denoting mediate agency which comes "between" (διά) and causes the act or state. If we would live, we must obtain life through the agency of Him who alone caused, procured, life for

sinners doomed to death. Reject Him, and there is no life; accept Him, and life is yours.

God's love indeed transcends all understanding. What a sacrifice for a human parent to send his only son, reared in all the comforts of a loving home, into some distant country there to spend his lifetime among filth and dirt, fever and sickness, superstition and misunderstanding, hatred and persecution! Yet that father is a human being sending a human being to other human beings. Here is God sending His own Son to creatures far beneath Him, into conditions far more revolting to His holiness and purity than to human nature contaminated with sin. A father may overcome his natural reluctance to send his son into such conditions by selfish motives—the hope of gain, of wealth, of honor, for himself and for his son. In God's sending of His Son there was not the slightest trace of selfishness. The welfare, the spiritual and eternal life, of His enemies was the sole motive of His love. A human father may send his son because he is under obligation to some one, to his government, to his God; God is under obligation to no one. He owed it neither to man, who had deserved to die, nor to Himself, who would have remained the ever Holy One, the unchanging Love, the blessed and blissful God, even if He had permitted all men to die without the hope of salvation. And still, of His own volition, according to the good pleasure of His will, He loved us and sent His Son, His Only-begotten, into the world. Who can fathom, who can sufficiently praise, the manifestation of this love? It is a manifestation truly divine, which God alone can bring to pass, a manifestation which proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that God indeed is Love, v. 8.

By His eulogy on the love of God the apostle has proved his statement that God is Love, v. 8 b. He now proceeds to show that love is indeed "of God," *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, v. 7.

V. 10: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." The apostle does not say, "This is love," but, "In this is love," emphasizing "is," *ἐστίν*. In this, love exists, has its being, its essence. For this use of *εἰμί* compare the phrase *ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ ὁ γάμος*, Rev. 1, 4, 8; 4, 8; 11, 7; 16, 5, the *ἐστίν* of Acts 17, 28; etc. The love of which the apostle speaks has its being, exists, "not in this, that we loved God." Such love is not of human origin. If the existence of this love depended on our love to God, there would be no such love and no possibility of such love. Christian love,—and that includes not only love toward God, but according to the entire context our love toward the brethren,—this love would be a *non ens*, a nonentity, if our love toward God were to be the cause or condition of it. The carnal mind is enmity against God, Rom. 8, 7;

7, 18 f. How can love toward God dwell in such a mind? No; such love is altogether, from its very first beginning, throughout its entire course, until its final glorious consummation yonder, "of God," *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, v. 7, flowing out of God as its only well-spring; in Him our love lives, moves, and has its being, v. 9.

Moreover, the origin, continuance, and consummation of this love is due to that selfsame *love* of God whose glorious manifestation the apostle has described in v. 9: for he continues, God "loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Note that the apostle here changes from the perfect (v. 9) to the aorist, "because the Incarnation is regarded as a distinct event, a historic landmark." (*Expositor's Greek Testament*.) As in the preceding verse, the apostle again is not satisfied with the bare statement that God loved us. Again he refers to the manifestation of this love in the sending of His Son and adds another detail in connection with the commissioning, which not merely brings out in a fuller measure what God's sending of the Son for our life involved, but at the same time proves that and why this commission was the only, but sure means of engendering love in our hearts. We read: "God loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." God sent His Son not to be merely the perfect example of love toward God and man nor only to be a teacher of ethics, to warn against the wickedness of sin, to point out its baneful consequences. That would not have helped the situation. Man, the slave of sin, Rom. 3, 23, knows all that by nature. His conscience rebukes him time and again; and if he succeeds in silencing its accusing voice, his own experience and the fate of his fellow-men ceaselessly and continuously din into his unwilling ears that sin is indeed a reproach to any people, that bodily sickness and mental diseases and sorrow and self-contempt and despair and death are the dread consequences of sin. And in spite of all the slave of sin "goeth after his sin straightway, as an ox goeth to his slaughter." Cp. Prov. 7, 22 ff. God knew that a mere teacher of morals, a mere example of ethical perfection, would not remedy man's ailment. What man needed was *propitiation* for his sins, and for the purpose of accomplishing a *propitiation* did God send His Son into the world.

Just what is meant by the word "propitiation"? *Ιλασμός* means an appeasing of another person, a reconciling of a person to oneself. In this sense the term and related words are found quite frequently in profane Greek. In the New Testament it occurs only here and in chap. 2, 2.\* It is found a number of times in the Septuagint in such contexts, or in translation of such terms, as cast an illuminating light upon the meaning of the Greek word as used in the

\* *Ιλαστήριον* is found Rom. 3, 25; Heb. 9, 5; *ιλάσκομαι*, Luke 18, 13; Heb. 2, 17; *Ιλεως*, Matt. 16, 22; Heb. 8, 12.

religious terminology of the Jews. Ezek. 44, 27 **לְאַסְמֹךְ** is the translation of **תְּנִפְחָה**, sin-offering. The ritual of the sin-offering, according to Lev. 4, consisted in laying the hand upon the sacrificial animal, thus transferring one's sins to the victim, which then was slain in place of the guilty sinner, who had deserved death. The purpose of the sin-offering was "to make an atonement" for him (Hebrew *kipper*, LXX *ἔξιλάσκεσθαι*), "and it shall be forgiven them" (*nislach*), Lev. 4, 20. 26. 31. 35. Though the word for *chattat* used by the translator of Leviticus is not **לְאַסְמֹךְ**, but varies between **וְτַחַת** **אַמְּרִתָּא**, **וְפֶরַת** **תַּחַת** **אַמְּרִתָּא**, **אַמְּרִתָּא**, etc., the translator of Ezek. 44, 27, uses the word **לְאַסְמֹךְ**, as giving the exact meaning conferred to the believing Israelite by the term *chattat*, *viz.*, that of an appeasing of God's wrath, a reconciliation of God to the sinner (*ἔξιλάσκεσθαι*), by means of a vicarious sacrifice, the sacrifice becoming "sin" (*chattat*) because of the transfer of the guilty one's sin to the guiltless animal. Cp. for literal fulfilment of this ritual 2 Cor. 5, 21. In Lev. 25, 9, "the day of atonement"; Num. 5, 8, "the ram of atonement," the word **לְאַסְמֹךְ** is the translation of *kippurim*. The ritual for the Day of Atonement is found in Lev. 16, teaching in every one of its symbols the vicarious atonement. Mark especially the transfer of sin by the laying on of the hands, the slaying of the one goat as a substitute for the people, the complete removal of sin by leading the scapegoat out of the camp into the desert. The blood of the "ram of atonement," literally, the ram of coverings, was to "make an atonement," literally, to place a covering upon him, *yekapper alaiw*, the Septuagint translating "atonement," **λειτέμ**, and "make atonement," *ἔξιλάσεται*. Hence the Septuagint very properly translates the **תְּנִפְחָה**, the "forgiveness," of Ps. 130, 4, **לְאַסְמֹךְ**; for forgiveness consists in the covering of sin by sacrificial blood vicariously shed.

This term, used in the Septuagint to translate various Hebrew words clearly denoting vicarious atonement, substitutionary reconciliation, by a transfer of sin to another, by the shedding of innocent blood in lieu of the blood of the guilty transgressor — this term, so familiar to the reader of the Greek Old Testament, the Bible of Greek-speaking Jews and Christians, was taken over in the fulness of its rich content as an adequate term to describe the purpose of the commissioning of the Son by the Father. So also the next phrase "for our sins," *περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, was a phrase well known to the readers of the Septuagint, and a more suitable word to express the underlying idea of **לְאַסְמֹךְ** could not have been found. According to Thayer, *περὶ* denotes originally "that around which an act or state revolves." The propitiation indeed revolves around the sin of man; the atoning blood of Jesus flows round about the sin and transgression of man. Only in this sense it

is a propitiation for, *concerning, on account of*, sin; it has the hiding, the covering up, of sin as its aim and object. And because it is the blood of Jesus Christ, God's only-begotten Son, it succeeds in accomplishing what all the blood of beasts could not effect, except as a divinely appointed symbol and foreshadowing of the perfect sacrifice of Christ. He is not only the propitiating Priest. He is at the same time Himself the Propitiation, Himself the Atonement, Himself our Reconciliation, the Son of God becoming the covering for our sin, hiding them with His perfect sacrifice. This is a divine atonement indeed, in which, as in His own beloved Son, God is well pleased, on account of which alone He is fully satisfied, appeased, reconciled, to sinful mankind. The Son of God the Propitiation for our sins! Who can fathom the depths of divine love, all love surpassing, that open before our eyes in these brief words? A love so all-comprehensive that it embraces all mankind, none excepted; a love so fervent that even the foreknowledge of that base ingratitude, that foul vituperation, that contemptuous rejection, wherewith the greater portion of mankind would meet this manifestation of love could not shake its determination to procure life for sinful, mortal man; a love so intense that God spared not His Son, the Only-begotten, in order to make atonement for our sin; a love withal so holy that it would consider nothing but a complete satisfaction of the justice of God, a full and adequate payment for the guilt of man, even though this payment would call for the death of the Son of God. O wondrous love, the love of God toward this world that man might live, yea, that he might *love!* We must not forget that the chief purpose of the apostle's reference to the propitiation for our sins was not merely to point out the magnitude of God's love nor its fundamental importance for our faith, but above all to show that this love is the life of our love, that our love could not exist without the atoning sacrifice of Christ, the propitiation for our sins wrought by the love of God manifested in the sending of His Son into the world. It was by this propitiation alone that man's life, v. 9, and man's love, v. 10, both of which had been destroyed by sin, were again made possible. Without the love of God and the propitiation of Christ there would be no true love in this world. Unitarians, Modernists, Christian Scientists, though prating of love and charity, have not love and know not love; their love is a phantom of their imagination, a love which has no existence except in their own fancy.

The love of God is a *holy* love, as we have seen. So the love engendered in man by this holy love of God is a holy love, abhorring that which God abhors, errors of doctrine as well as errors of life; and as loving children beloved of their Father, men in whom this holy love has been engendered follow His command

to avoid such as create divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which they have learned, Rom. 16, 17, and to put away from among themselves all wicked persons, 1 Cor. 5, 13. Such an attitude toward errorists and manifest sinners, far from being incompatible with true love, is rather a characteristic of that love which is patterned after the example of God's love and in obedience to His word and will.

V. 11: "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

The apostle applies the precious truths of v. 10 in the form of an evangelical admonition. Every Christian needs to be admonished, and evangelical exhortations are all-powerful and efficacious with a Christian. Cp. Walther, *Pastorale*, 86-88; Fritz, *Pastoral Theology*, p. 76-79.

"Beloved." They are his beloved brethren, or children, as he often calls them. In the love bestowed upon them by the apostle they were experiencing that love which he was so highly commanding to them, and which was engendered in John by the unspeakable love which he had just described.

The very fact that the apostle, in loving them, was practising what he preached, the fact that they were experiencing the joy of being loved by a disciple of the Lord, these facts were in themselves a powerful inducement to follow his example and to make others participants in the satisfaction of being beloved ones. That is not the only nor the chief motive for their love. "If in this manner," as described in v. 10, "God has loved us, also we are indebted, under obligation, to love one another." If His love as manifested in the sending of His Son into the world to be the propitiation for our sins supplied the possibility, yea, the very life of our love, then certainly we are under most urgent obligation, we owe it to God and to our brethren, to practise this love, make diligent use of this divine gift, love our brethren as we and they are being loved by our heavenly Father. 1 Cor. 13.

An outline following closely the argument of the apostle may be formulated in this manner: *Beloved, let Us Love One Another.* 1. For every one that loves, knows God's love, v. 9; 2. both love and he that loves are of God, vv. 10, 11.—*We Ought to Love One Another.* 1. For this purpose God loved us; 2. for this purpose He has given us a pattern of true love.—*The Matchless Love of God*, as manifested 1. in the sending of His Son; 2. in the creation of our love.—*Christian Science an Antichristian Doctrine*, in its conception of God, of the deity of Christ, of sin, of atonement, of love.—*The Love Proclaimed by Christian Scientists Is Not Love.* 1. Christian Science denies the deity of Christ; 2. Christian Science denies the vicarious atonement. In both parts show that these

truths are fundamental, not only for Christian faith, but for the life of our love. Only the propitiation makes our love possible, and only the deity of Christ makes this propitiation possible.—This text may be used to show *The Antichristian Character of Modernism*. 1. The Christ of the Modernists is not the Son of God; 2. their propitiation is not a vicarious atonement; 3. their love is not the love engendered by Christ.

T. L.

---

## Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections

---

### First Sunday after Easter, Quasimodogeniti

1 PET. 1, 3-9

Easter is the festival of hope. Even the children of this world indulge in pleasant thoughts at Eastertide: A beautiful, though mythical, symbol of rejuvenescent nature; as such hope-inspiring, giving promise of better things after failure and disappointment.

If Easter had no deeper significance, its promise of hope were vain, even if it were based on (Modernism!) a Christ who, though not actually risen, lives in his lofty ideals. This world passes away and with it the hopes and happiness attached to it. Death and the grave remain the ultimate prospect, 1 Cor. 15, 19.

The Easter-message affords genuine hope, which reaches beyond this life and world.

#### The Christian's Blessed Hope

1. *Its foundation*    2. *Its content*    3. *Its realization*

##### 1

V. 3. Indeed, the foundation of our hope is not in ourselves, Eph. 2, 1; 2, 3; Rom. 6, 23. Not only temporal death, but eternal separation from God, the Source of life and bliss. That implies utter hopelessness, despair for time and eternity, Eph. 2, 12.

The foundation of our hope rests in God. He alone could bring life from the dead, v. 1. In regeneration He gave us a new, a spiritual, life, not dominated by sin nor subject to its curse. By the Word of Truth, Jas. 1, 18, and through Baptism, Titus 3, 6, God brought us to faith, unto obedience, etc., v. 2, 1 Pet. 1, 22. When we, sprinkled with His blood through the Gospel, first trusted in its atoning power, God wrought a miraculous change in us, Eph. 2, 5; Col. 2, 13 ("quickened"). Then began the life of which St. Paul writes: Gal. 2, 20.—How different the prospect that now opens to us! In the life of faith the hope-destroyer, sin, has no part. We are freed from its guilt and power, alive unto God. Since it is life that is of God, Eph. 4, 18, should it be void of hope? "Begotten

*unto hope.*" God's purpose. The hopes of the world often deceive and, if realized, prove unsatisfying. Here a "lively" hope, having in it the life of God, of which the new birth is merely the beginning. Having come from God, it leads to God, reaching perfection in eternity, 1 John 3, 2. — Precious gift of God at the baptismal font, at the conversion of a sinner!

A gift of God it is. "According to His abundant mercy." His infinite love laid the foundation of our hope in the sacrificing of His Son, John 3, 16; Titus 3, 6, 7. No merit, no distinguishing mark, between us and those as yet without faith and hope; no cooperation. We were active participants in our new birth as little as in our natural birth. Because God is rich in mercy, He rescued us from the hopelessness of our sinful state, united us with the Savior, and translated us into the life that alone deserves the name. Afar off, we were made nigh ("found me when I sought Him not"); enemies of God, we were made accepted in the Beloved. — Hymn 308, 1, 5. What is more trustworthy than the mercy of God? "Now I have found the sure foundation."

Moreover, the apostle states the *tangible evidence* of the reality of our hope. "Through the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ." Christ's resurrection is not merely an evidence of a future life in general; it has an intimate relation to our lively hope — "through." It is the earnest that our Christian hope is not a fantastic dream. Our hope is centered on a living Christ, declared to be the Son of God with power, Rom. 1, 4, able to fulfil His promise, John 14, 19; who as our Substitute, our Brother in the flesh, entered into glory and has become the First-fruits of them that slept, 1 Cor. 15, 20. We, being united with Him by faith, shall follow in order, 1 Cor. 15, 23. — The Christian in his hope does not chase a phantom, but looks forward to a life and an immortality that is *brought to light*, a positive reality, 2 Tim. 1, 10. — Now, what does this hope include? What is its content?

## 2

V. 4. In describing our hope, the apostle carries out the figure in which he set forth its foundation. "Inheritance." Begotten of God, we are His children, Gal. 3, 26. Even human law recognizes the right of inheritance. We are heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ, Rom. 8, 17. Wonderful inheritance! Heirs of Him "who is the blessed and only Potentate," etc., 1 Tim. 6, 15, 16. Joint heirs with Christ, who was received up into glory and sitteth at the right hand of God. A life of glory and bliss beyond human understanding. — This inheritance is "reserved in *heaven*" for us "to be revealed in the last time," "at the appearing of Jesus Christ." The Christian's hope is directed heavenward, not earthward. The

modernistic social gospel, seeking only moral, social reform and human betterment, would deprive the Christians of their blessed inheritance bought with the blood of God's Son. Be not deceived! Christ has not promised "mansions" on earth, but mansions in His Father's house. Christ's Gospel points your hope away from this vale of tears, which it will remain, all the dreams of religious enthusiasts to the contrary notwithstanding; away from a "heaven on earth" to an inheritance reserved in *heaven*, the grandeur, beauty, and glory of which is beyond compare.

Mark its excellences. It is "incorruptible." Temporal bequests, earthly treasures, are subject to decay. The germ of death and corruption is in them as a result of sin. Our heavenly inheritance is secure against the influences of destruction.—It is "undefiled." Temporal inheritances are frequently tainted with injustice, avarice, fraud, ill-gotten gain. Their possession so often entails an evil conscience and the curse of unhappiness. The object of the Christian's hope is pure, unspotted, holy, the inheritance of the saints in light, 2 Pet. 2, 13. Unalloyed pleasure.—"Fadeth not away." Earthly beauty and glory is like the flower that withers. Quickly loses its charm, even surfeits and disgusts. Our heavenly inheritance retains constant freshness. The first rapture upon entering the glorified world endures without end.—Truly, when this inheritance is "revealed in the last time" ("wherein," *viz.*, time), we shall "greatly rejoice," vv. 6, 8, and in contemplation of it we have a foretaste even here, rejoicing in hope, Rom. 12, 12.

### 3

But now the anxious question, Will this blessed hope be realized in *me*? What Christian is not thus troubled? True, we know the inheritance is "reserved" for us. But will I be there to receive it? Danger of falling from the faith. I am a frail, sinful being, so prone to yield.

The attainment of our hope rests securely in God's hands, v. 5. He is mightier than our foes. Our faith and hope are His gracious handiwork. He will continue the good work, Phil. 1, 6; John 10, 28.

God's promise stands sure even though: v. 6; Ps. 77, 9. Our afflictions are, under God's direction, a trial of our faith, v. 7, teaching us to rely solely on God's mercy and power. They redound to the honor of God, v. 7, as will be manifest when we shall have received the end of our faith, even the salvation of our souls, v. 9. Therefore we should not murmur, but rather: Rom. 5, 3—5.

Admonition to bless God, as in vv. 3, 4, and to use the means of grace, through which our blessed hope is sustained and brought to a joyful fruition.

J. W. WERLING

## Second Sunday after Easter, Misericordias Domini

EPH. 2, 4-10

The glorious Easter-festival preached the miraculous resurrection of Jesus Christ. "Christ abolished death," 2 Tim. 1, 10. "Death is swallowed up in victory," 1 Cor. 15, 54. This is undoubtedly the most startling occurrence in the annals of history. Scripture has made it the central, the pivotal, truth of the Gospel, Acts 2, 23, 24; 4, 33; Rom. 1, 4; 1 Cor. 15, 17; 1 Thess. 4, 14; 1 Pet. 1, 3; 3, 18. There is a direct connection between Christ's resurrection and our quickening, not merely our final resurrection, but also our quickening unto spiritual life. Today's text is such an echo of the Easter-message.

## God hath Quickened Us together with Christ

1. *What is meant by this act of God?*
2. *What prompted it?*
3. *What purpose does it serve?*

## 1

"Quicken," v. 5, means to make alive. Context shows this. Apostle described natural man as "dead in trespasses and sins," v. 1. In vv. 2, 3 he showed clearly that this death means a life "according to the course of this world," in the spirit and under the influence of Satan, centered upon the lusts and desires of the flesh, and subject unto the wrath of God. Cf. Rom. 1 and 2. Spiritual death is severance from God, the Source of life, lack of knowledge of God, lack of desire to serve Him; on the contrary, nothing but hatred, mistrust, disobedience. This is also our condition by nature. Note "we," v. 5.

"Quicken" in this connection means to regenerate, convert. This is true also of "saved," v. 8. (See Stoeckhardt, *Epheserbrief*.) This is God's work. Note that term "dead" precludes every thought of any ability within man to convert himself. Note also "not of yourselves," v. 8, and "not of works," v. 9. God states that He does it. Only the Source of Life can create life where there is only death. (Cf. v. 10, "create"; 2 Cor. 5, 17; Gal. 6, 15, "new creature.") The conversion of a man dead in sins is a creative act of God. Faith is God's work within us, vv. 8, 10. God performs this work through the Gospel and the Sacraments, Rom. 1, 16; 10, 17; 1 Cor. 2, 4; Acts 2, 38; 22, 16; Col. 2, 12; Eph. 5, 26; Matt. 26, 28. The expressions "through faith," v. 8, and "It is the gift of God," v. 8 (note contrast), certainly emphasize that our conversion is God's work.

The contrast, "death," "quicken," emphasizes what a marvelous thing God has accomplished when He has brought a sinner to faith.

Life, true life, is engendered, which manifests itself in contact with God, interest in spiritual matters, knowledge of God, a will to serve Him, filial fear and love of God, and childlike trust in Him.

## 2

"It is the gift of God," "not of yourselves," "not of works," vv. 8, 9, shows convincingly that nothing within man prompted the quickening. Not only does death not contribute anything, it even does not invite or motivate any one to do something, toward life. For natural man this is a very difficult and humiliating, but very necessary and profitable lesson.

Since the cause is not in man, it must be in God. "Love," great love, v. 4. Yes, this is genuine love which can move God to grant spiritual life to the spiritually dead. It is great, abundant love. It embraces every individual sinner; and if every one were to draw upon it, it would still not diminish. "Mercy," rich, abundant mercy, v. 4. God had pity upon man's hopeless and helpless condition. There is a limitless supply of such mercy in God. "Grace," v. 8. This statement occurs twice. It again emphasizes that the cause is altogether in God and not in man.

## 3

V. 6. The apostle now employs the thought of Christ's resurrection and session. Christ entered into glorified life. He is heavenly, 1 Cor. 15, 48. By faith we are "buried with Christ," "quickened together with Him," "made to sit together in heavenly places," vv. 5, 6. In our conversion we not merely received the benefits which Jesus earned for us, but also entered upon a new life, a heavenly life, Phil. 3, 20; Eph. 1, 3; Col. 3, 1, 3. This heavenly-mindedness is a matter not merely of the future, but also of the present. (See Stoeckhardt, *Epheserbrief*, p. 121.)

V. 10. God makes "new creatures" of us also for this purpose: "created . . . unto good works." Our conversion is a translation from death into life, and life must manifest itself, show activity. Justification is followed at once by sanctification. Faith produces works, Rom. 12; Jas. 2. Here is an excellent opportunity to show how the risen Christ lives in His Christians. Our life in Christ is a life in good works in the home, in the community, in the congregation, in the District, and in the Church at large.

V. 10. Also this is an act of God's grace. Even our good works are "ordained by God." He prepared them that we might walk in them. We deserve no credit or glory. It is all God's doing.

V. 7. This focuses our attention upon the final consummation of God's plans. Then "the exceeding riches of His grace," etc., will be truly manifest.

J. W. BEHNKEN

**Third Sunday after Easter, Jubilate**

1 JOHN 4, 9-14

"The love of many shall wax cold," Matt. 24, 12b. This prediction of the Savior concerning the times preceding His final coming we see fulfilled on every hand. How little true love to God and one's fellow-man in the world! Gen. 4, 9; Luke 10, 31, 32. Had it not been for the Government's relief work in recent years, no doubt thousands, yea, millions would have suffered dire want in the midst of plenty. What is the real cause of this dreadful lack of love? Men no longer know the one true God nor His wonderful love; cp. 1 John 4, 7, 8. Men must therefore hear more of God's wonderful love, not only on Christmas Day, Good Friday, and Easter, but throughout the year.

**God's Great and Wonderful Love to Us**

1. *The manifestation of this love*
2. *The blessed fruit of this love*

**1**

"God is Love," vv. 8b, 16b. These beautiful words immediately before and after our text are, as it were, the golden frame of the exquisite picture of God's love presented to us in text. God not only *has* love, as human beings, but He is Love altogether, a great, big fire of love, reaching from heaven to earth and back again, from eternity to eternity, Jer. 31, 3. This great and marvelous love to us God did not keep hidden and covered up, but He has manifested it, v. 9. God has manifested His great love to us already in the creation and preservation of all things, especially by creating us so wonderfully, by giving us so many good things in life for our sustenance and enjoyment, Acts 14, 17; Luke 16, 25a; Ps. 104, 24.

But proof supreme of God's great and adorable love we have in the work of redemption, vv. 9, 10. The love of God manifested and revealed to us here is great indeed.

a) Because of the tremendous sacrifice it made. All true love is manifested by sacrifice. What greater sacrifice could God have made? He sent His only-begotten Son into the world, v. 9, had Him become man, a very lowly man, put Him under the Law, had Him suffer and die and endure all the curse of the Law for us, Gal. 4, 4; 3, 13.

b) God's love is great because of what it has accomplished. In Christ it brought life, v. 9, true spiritual life, eternal life and bliss in heaven. In Christ God's love brought propitiation, v. 10, atonement, satisfaction for all our sins, 1 John 2, 2. Jesus is "the Savior of the world," v. 14b.

c) God's love in Christ is great and wonderful because it is all-inclusive. It excludes none, not even the vilest and blackest sinner. — Abraham's love truly was great when he was willing to sacrifice his only son, whom he loved most dearly. But is not God's love much greater? Abraham was willing to give up his son for his good God and best Friend; but God actually gave up His own Son for His enemies, Rom. 5, 8, 10.

d) God's love is great because it is *free* love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God," v. 10. God first loved us, v. 19. Not we, but He, made the beginning in loving. He loved us when we were not at all lovable, but in sins and filth and rags and in death. He loved us not because He needed our love to enhance His happiness, but simply because He had mercy and pity on us and because He wanted to make us exceedingly happy in time and eternity.

e) This great and wonderful love of God is also *sure* love, v. 14. John is not passing on to his readers what he had gotten merely by hearsay. John with his fellow-apostles was an eye- and ear-witness of this great and wonderful love of God. He was with Jesus three years, saw this love of God in Christ's life, in Gethsemane, in the high priest's palace, at the cross.

You have heard what God's Holy Spirit tells you through the faithful and dependable witness, John, about God's great love. What should you do with it? Despise, reject it? God forbid! Do what John and his friends did, v. 16a. May the Holy Spirit, through the Word and the Sacraments, shed abroad also in your heart this love of God! Rom. 5, 5. May you ever sing: —

God loves me dearly, grants me salvation;  
God loves me dearly, loves even me.

Hence will I praise Thee, O Love Eternal;  
Hence will I praise Thee all my life long.

## 2

Vv. 11—13. If the great and wonderful love of God in Christ has been manifested to us and really fills our believing hearts, then those otherwise so cold and loveless hearts of ours cannot remain so any longer, but must also begin to love. The *blessed fruit* of God's love must appear. Love begets love, we say. Now, if God loves us beyond all our understanding, we should expect the apostle to say that in turn we also should love the loving God. Later, v. 19, he actually does that; but here, v. 11, he stresses *brotherly* love. If it is true, as it actually is, that God loved us so amazingly, beyond all measure, then it should naturally follow that we love also *one another*, our brethren and sisters in the faith. But, of course, our love should not stop there. As God's love includes all men, even the vilest sinner, His bitterest enemies, so our love should also include all men, even those who mistreat and abuse us, Gal. 6, 10.

V. 12: "No man hath seen God at any time," etc. God in His real glory and majesty is invisible to us. "He dwells in a light which no man can approach unto," 1 Tim. 6, 16. But we can serve this invisible God in our brethren and fellow-men. If a man prates about his love to God and does not love, even hates, his fellow-man, he is a liar, v. 20. But if we love one another, God dwells in us, the great and invisible God makes His abiding home with us. His love is "perfected" in us, reaches its end and aim with us, also in this respect.

V. 13. The love which we have toward our fellow-men and Christians is irrefutable proof that we have the most intimate union and communion with Him, our loving God and Savior. We are sure then that God "hath given us of His Spirit," some of His Spirit's life, power, and love, and that one day we shall see God, 1 John 3, 2; 1 Cor. 13, 12.

John, the writer of our text, is rightly called the Apostle of Love. The Lord loved him dearly, John 13, 23; 19, 26, and by this love engendered in him true love toward God and his brethren. "Beloved," he calls the Christians again and again, vv. 1. 7. 11. We are told that, when John was old and feeble and could not walk any more, they had to carry him to the gathering of the Christians, and there he would repeat over and over again these words, "Children, love one another."

Let us follow John in his ardent and unselfish love to others. How much opportunity to show true Christian love to our brethren who are in bodily and spiritual distress! Let us therefore often expose our icicle hearts to the warm and melting sunshine of God's great and wonderful love in Christ Jesus, and the blessed fruits of this love will certainly become manifest.

J. T. ROSCHKE

#### Fourth Sunday after Easter, Cantate

2 TIM. 2, 8-13

In our day is being fulfilled Rev. 20, 7-9a. From within and without enemies are attacking the Church of God. Rankest paganism is clamoring for recognition as scientific Christianity, Modernism, unionism, etc. Shall we give up? In the prison at Rome sat an old man, awaiting death because he had preached the Gospel. Paganism was about to celebrate its seeming triumphs over God's saints. Yet Paul is not discouraged. He does not think of becoming disloyal to his trust. He urges that the Gospel be preached, no matter what may befall him and others, 2 Tim. 1, 6-8; 2, 1. 2. In our text he adds weighty reasons.

**Remain Faithful to Christ and His Old Gospel**

1. *Remember that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead*
2. *Remember that God's Word is not fettered*
3. *Remember that God's promises and decrees stand unmovable*

**1**

V. 8. Each word of this admonition is a powerful urge to remain faithful to the Gospel. Remember Jesus. Hymns 91, 92. Remember the Christ, the God-appointed, anointed Savior. He is the only, but sure Way to salvation, God's own Savior. Remember the price He paid! "Dead." Is. 53; Phil. 2, 7, 8; Rom. 5, 6-8. Remember, He was raised, He is Victor over all His and our enemies, 1 Cor. 15, 55-57. This is the Gospel preached by Paul, called by him "my" Gospel, not because, like modern gospels, it is of man's invention, but because he had accepted this Gospel of the blessed God, 1 Tim. 1, 11; 2 Tim. 3, 15, 16, as His own cherished treasure. A Gospel, good news indeed, faithful and worthy of all acceptation. Is not this Gospel worthy also of our faithful adherence and loyalty?

**2**

V. 9. Paul suffered trouble because of the Gospel ever since he had accepted it, Acts 9, 15, 16; 1 Cor. 6, 4-10; 2 Cor. 11, 23-33. Charged with being a dangerous evil-doer, he now lies bound in prison, looking forward to certain death, 2 Tim. 4, 6. Yet he remains faithful to Christ and His Gospel. Though he is bound, the Word of God is not bound, cannot be bound. Even in fetters he preached the Word, Acts 28, 30, 31; Phil. 1, 12, 13; yea, his bonds encouraged others to preach, Phil. 1, 14. Though he knew that soon his poor lisping, stammering tongue would lie silent in the grave, that Gospel preached by his tongue would not be silenced, could not be fettered. The enemies trying to silence the Gospel are creatures, powerful, crafty, cruel perhaps, the wise and mighty, the rulers of Church and State, the leaders of science and society, and standing behind them, instigating them, Satan, the wicked Foe, Eph. 6, 12; yet they are ever creatures, no more, while the Word they seek to fetter is God's own, the Word of the living, all-powerful Lord of hosts, and therefore: John 6, 63. The enemies may gain some ground; congregations may apostatize; cities, states, countries, may sink back into paganism. Yet the Word shall not be bound. The Gospel shall be preached, and preached effectively, successfully, even unto the end of the world. Ps. 2; Matt. 16, 18; 1 Kings 19, 10, 18. We are not fighting for a lost cause. Immanuel, God with us, is our watchword. This conviction urges us on to unwavering loyalty; for we know that God's promises and decrees stand sure.

## 3

Remember Jesus Christ of *the seed of David*, born in fulfilment of God's promise, 2 Sam. 7, 12 ff., and raised because of this promise, Acts 13, 34, 35. God will keep all His promises, 2 Cor. 1, 20. In keeping with the Lord's eternal decree the elect of God will obtain salvation, v. 10. How sure may we be of success, relying on the Word of the unchanging God! And what an urge to preach the Gospel! For then we become His instruments in carrying out His eternal, unchanging decree of salvation. So He will keep all promises, vv. 11—13. We died with Christ in regeneration, we daily crucify our flesh that it may not again live and rule over us. That requires constant battle. Yet undismayed we remain faithful to Christ and to His Gospel, for we shall also live with Him. What though we must suffer? What though Satan sends us afflictions? What though people consider and call us queer, odd, pietistic? What though we yield to our enemies at times? These seeming victories over God's saints last but a little hour, at most a lifetime. We know that Satan can send us no more than God permits; we know that, "if we suffer, we shall also reign with Him," rule here in His strength over suffering, sin, flesh; rule there in everlasting liberty and righteousness. On the other hand, if we deny Him, His decree stands: "He that believeth not shall be damned." He is faithful in keeping His promises, but just as firm and unchanging, in His threats. Deny Him, and there is no other salvation, Heb. 10, 26.

Summing up the urgent reasons why we should remain faithful to Christ and His Gospel, close with a fervent admonition to hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering. TH. LAETSCH



---

## Miscellanea

---

### Summer Session at Concordia Seminary

In agreement with a resolution passed at the last meeting of Synod, held in Cleveland, O., in 1935, the Board of Control and the faculty of Concordia Seminary are arranging to conduct a regular summer session at the institution. The plan for the coming summer calls for a Pastors' Institute in two sections, each with two series of six lectures for one week, and a summer-school offering a progressive series of courses in exegetical, systematic, historical, and practical subjects. The time of the summer-school this year will be from July 5 to July 17, inclusive. Full information will be given in our next issue, and immediately thereafter a pamphlet with a description of the work and the courses will be available. Address all inquiries pertaining to the summer session to the director of the school, Prof. P. E. Kretzmann, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

### Das Gesetz unser Zuchtmeister auf Christum<sup>1)</sup>

Das Verständnis des Spruches „Das Gesetz ist unser Zuchtmeister gewesen auf (eis) Christum“, Gal. 3, 24, in dem Sinn, als ob das Gesetz für Christum erziehe, ist mißlich, weil dem Gesetze damit ein Zug zum Heil in Christo beigelegt wird, ein Zug, den die übrige Schrift dem Gesetze abspricht. Unter dem Verhängnis dieses Sinnes steht aber die Auslegung dieser Schriftstelle in den weitesten Theologentreisen. Luther schreibt IX, 800: „Das Gesetz hat sein Ziel, wie weit es gehen und was es ausrichten soll, nämlich bis auf Christum, die Unbußfertigen schreden mit Gottes Zorn und Ungnade.“ Wie das zu verstehen ist, sagt er VII, 82 f.: „Das Gesetz macht allein durstig und dient nirgends zu, denn daß es die Herzen schrede. . . . Das heißt, der Durst, der währet also lange, bis daß Christus kommt und spricht: Willst du gerne aufzieden sein, Ruhe und ein gutes Gewissen haben, so rate ich dir, komm her zu mir.“ Nach Luther ist also unsere Stelle temporal zu verstehen: „Das Gesetz ist unser Zuchtmeister gewesen, bis daß Christus kam.“ Christus ist eben des Gesetzes Ende, Röm. 10, 4. Der temporale Sinn liegt denn auch Gal. 3 im vorangehenden und nachfolgenden Zusammenhang: „Ehe denn der Glaube kam, wurden wir unter dem Gesetz verwahret und verschlossen, bis der zukünftige Glaube offenbart wurde“, Gal. 3, 23. „Nun aber der Glaube gekommen ist, sind wir nicht mehr unter dem Zuchtmeister“, V. 25; vgl. V. 19: „Das Gesetz ist dazu gekommen um der Sünde willen, bis der Same käme.“ Im 9. Kapitel des Hebräerbrieves wird diese ganze Sache ganz genau so gedeutet, daß die Sühnungen unter dem Gesetz zu „äußerlicher Heiligkeit“ aufgelegt wurden bis auf die Zeit der Besserung“, nämlich der Verichtigung des Gottesdienstes, von der Christus schon zu dem samaritanischen Weibe redete: „Es kommt die Zeit und ist schon jetzt, daß die wahrhaften Anbeter werden den Vater anbeten im Geist und in der Wahrheit“, Joh. 4, 23, wann also nicht mehr bloß

---

1) Diese kurze Arbeit wird hiermit zur Prüfung vorgelegt.

äußerliche Heiligkeit, sondern vernünftiger („geistiger“, Stöckhardt) Gottesdienst mit innerlicher Wahrhaftigkeit gepflegt wird, Röm. 12, 1.

Es sind eben die Begriffe „Gesetz“ und „Christus“ hier historisch zu bestimmen. Unter Gesetz versteht hier der Apostel nicht das, was er Röm. 7, 14 sagt: „Das Gesetz ist geistlich“; D. Walther (Gesetz u. Evangelium, 1893, 8): „Es geht auf den Geist.“ Dies ist der Begriff des Gesetzes als beschränkbaren Willens Gottes. Im Zusammenhang von Gal. 3 aber ist das Gesetz gemäß dem Ausdruck „unter dem Buchtmäster sein“ als das alttestamentliche Institut des Gottesdienstes, die israelitische Ökonomie des Gesetzes, zu fassen.<sup>2)</sup> Unter „Christus“ ist dann das Institut des Gottesdienstes zu verstehen, das mit Christo seinen Anfang nahm, Hebr. 2, 3, die Ökonomie des Glaubens, das neue „Testament“, Gal. 3, 17; Matth. 26, 28; Röm. 11, 27. Dabei hat dann auch das „wir“ historischen Sinn: wir ersten Christen standen unter der Ökonomie des Gesetzes, bis mit Christo der Glaube geoffenbart wurde und wir mit dem Glauben an den gekommenen Christus in die Ökonomie des Glaubens eintraten; vgl. Röm. 6, 14: „Ihr seid nicht mehr unter dem Gesetz, sondern unter der Gnade.“ Eine ähnliche historische Bemerkung findet sich Röm. 5, 18, 14: „Die Sünde war in der Welt bis auf das Gesetz. . . . Der Tod herrschte von Adam bis auf Mosen.“ Das Morale des Gesetzes aber gilt bis an der Welt Ende, wie Paulus lehrt Röm. 8, 31: „Wie? Haben wir denn das Gesetz auf? Das sei ferne! Sondern wir richten das Gesetz auf.“

Der temporale Sinn der als-Phrasen findet sich selbstverständlich sehr oft auch im Neuen Testamente. Luk. 1, 20: „welche Worte erfüllt werden bis auf ihre Zeit“, wenn die Zeit ihrer Erfüllung kommt. Eph. 1, 14: „Der Heilige Geist ist das Pfand unsers Erbes bis zur Erlösung des Eigentums“, bis auf die Zeit, da wir als Gottes Eigentumsteil der Menschen erlöst werden von allem Übel. Vgl. 1 Thess. 4, 15; Phil. 1, 10; 2, 16; 2 Petr. 2, 9; 3, 7.

Am Ende der letzten Stelle: „Himmel und Erde werden durch sein Wort gespart, daß sie zum Feuer aufzehalten werden am Tage des Gerichts und Verdammnis der gottlosen Menschen“ sei noch Röm. 8, 20, 21 befehlen: „sintemal die Kreatur unterworfen ist der Eitelkeit ohne ihren Willen, sondern um deswillen, der sie unterworfen hat auf Hoffnung. Denn auch die Kreatur frei werden wird von dem Dienst des vergänglichen Wesens zur herrlichen Freiheit der Kinder Gottes“, zur Zeit der herrlichen Befreiung der Kinder Gottes. Es ist möglich, den Spruch dahin zu verstehen, als ob die jetzt der Eitelkeit unterworfene Kreatur einmal frei werden würde, daß sie teilhabe an der herrlichen Freiheit der Kinder Gottes. Das ist wider die ganze sonstige Heilige Schrift. Die Befreiung der Kreatur besteht darin, daß sie, die unvernünftige Kreatur, von dem auf sie gelegten Fluch durch Verbrennung frei wird, Hebr. 6, 8. Die Existenz der unvernünftigen Kreatur hört damit auf.

W. Georgi

2) Unsere Galaterstelle sieht davon ab, daß in der Schrift unter der Gesetzesökonomie „die äußerlichen Säuhungen“ zugleich „Schatten von dem, was zukünftig war“, Schatten „des Körpers in Christo“ waren, Kol. 2, 17. Dieser Gedanke betrifft das Gesetz spielt hier nicht herein.

### Ministerial Training in the Protestant Episcopal Church

We take for granted that every minister is interested in seeing how the matter of ministerial training is handled in other denominations. From the *Living Church* of November 21, 1936, we take over some illuminating paragraphs as to the way in which prospective ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church prepare for their calling. Before quoting, we ought to say that in the Protestant Episcopal Church one having passed a minor examination is ordained as a deacon, and then, after some experience in actual church-work, one may take the chief examination which has to precede one's ordination as rector. With this explanation in mind, our readers will understand what we now take over from the article of Dr. W. T. Townsend of Pawtucket, R. I., in the paper mentioned: —

"It sometimes happens that a man with a very sketchy background, by concentrating on the few subjects required by the general canon for the diaconate, can pass a very creditable examination.

"He then goes to work either as assistant in a large parish or in a small mission of his own. The work is new and very exacting, requiring all his time; yet he is expected to prepare for the more difficult examination ahead on which he has not previously concentrated. The result is either that the man fails in several subjects, or, as sometimes happens, the date is set for the ordination before he is examined, invitations are even issued, and then pressure is brought to bear on the examining chaplains and the standing committee to find a way to get the man through. Imagine that happening in a bar examination or a State medical board! We have dealt with this in our own diocese by the canon mentioned above, and we have memorialized General Convention to consider a like step for the whole Church.

"Two objections present themselves at the outset. Most candidates for the ministry seem to be handicapped financially. At least that is the impression I get from the many pleas that further scholastic preparation is a financial impossibility. Then I have heard the question honestly asked if all this care is really necessary. This summer a bishop (not an American bishop, I am glad to say) even suggested to me that too much education would be a handicap, as the young man might feel too important to be wasted on a small country parish.

"First let us consider the financial side of the question. We are frequently told, when we advise a postulant to get more preseminal training, that it is financially impossible; he positively cannot afford it. The plea of poverty is made so strongly that one has to take a strict hold on his sympathies to keep them from being traitors to his conscience. In reality we have here the finest test of fitness. The one indispensable qualification for the ministry is to be able to do the impossible. The Church has been faced with that task in all ages, but never more than today. If these men are to be successful priests, they must learn that lesson in the very beginning, and I know no better method than to work one's way through college. I know because I did it for years.

"Secondly, our colleges are graduating year after year groups of young men and women whose religious thinking is in the majority of

cases hopelessly muddled. These boys and girls are coming back to our parishes. What message has the Church for such young people, the future leaders of their respective communities? That will largely depend on the ability of the local priest to help them in their religious thinking, and this will again depend on the respect which his mental equipment will inspire. The Church ought seriously to ask herself if she is willing to abdicate that leadership in the intellectual world which in ages past she has so proudly maintained.

"One of the surprising things that I have gathered from my work as an examining chaplain is that the subjects in which candidates frequently make the poorest showing are dogmatic theology and English Bible. In these days when the Incarnation and all that it implies is being attacked on every side, it seems little short of suicide for the Church to put into her cures men who have not the most thorough grounding in the fundamentals of our faith. Those who hold the Unitarian position will have all the reasons why they do not believe at their fingers' ends, and our men cannot give any kind of an answer to one who asks them for a reason of the hope that is in them. It is merely elementary to say that the Bible is the main tool in the ministry. Unless the preacher can handle it as the mechanic does his lathe, he is not qualified for his work. I once heard the late Bishop Courtney, that prince of preachers, say that, when he decided to enter the ministry, not only did he read his Bible, but for several years he read little else.

"There is one great qualification which is largely out of the hands of the examining chaplains, that is, training for conducting the services and preaching. I feel I can add little to what has been so ably said by Canon Bell and Fr. Morse-Boycott except by way of emphasis. In most of our parishes we are ministering not only to our own church people, but also to the large fringe of the unchurched who live around us. In the majority of cases these are most excellent people, but paganly indifferent to all the claims of organized religion. These people can be reached, but only by real preaching. If our churches are half—yes and more than half—empty, we must not place the blame on the age. Nor can we blame the message; it is the same message that has stirred the souls of men for centuries. The fault must be the channel through which that message is presented to a perplexed world.

"As a great teacher once said: 'In the old days the prophet exclaimed, "O Lord, here am I"; but now he says, "O Lord, where am I?"'" A.

### **Victories of Christian Missions among the Jews**

Is mission-work among the Jews as fruitless as it is often pictured to be? This subject is treated by Rev. J. Hoffman Cohn, General Secretary of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, in the *Presbyterian* of December 3, 1936. From his interesting article we take over a few gripping paragraphs:—

"Let us take the story of the Polish Jew Isidor Loewenthal. Late one bleak November day an itinerant Jewish pedler stopped at a house near Wilmington, Del. The master of the house, a Presbyterian minister, took pity on the wet and poorly clad stranger and invited him to have dinner

and spend the night with him. That evening the minister discovered to his amazement that the destitute Jewish pedler was a master of Hebrew and other languages and a student of philosophy and science. The minister became interested and offered him the hospitality of his home until he should find work. Work was found, and years later the minister received this letter from the erstwhile pedler: 'It was at your house, by your earnest prayers at family worship, to which I went partly from curiosity, partly from politeness, by your humble supplications, that I was first awakened to my lost condition. I began to open my Bible. I was astonished at what I found there, and became more and more convinced that something was wrong with my life.'

"The erstwhile pedler, Isidor Loewenthal, was ultimately converted through the interest and counsel of his friend, the minister, who had the joy of leading him to Christ and baptizing him. After graduating from Lafayette College, Loewenthal entered Princeton Theological Seminary and later graduated with highest honors. As class essayist he wrote on 'India as a Missionary Field.' He was licensed by the presbytery of New Brunswick and offered himself to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church. India was the field he chose. He left New York as a missionary to that country and landed at Peshawar, Afghanistan, the pioneer to that district. Here, after a ministry of only nine years, he died. At the time of his death he was master of Pushtu, Persian, Cashmere, Hindustani, Arabic, Hebrew, English, German, and French and could converse with fluency in almost all the numerous dialects of Northern India. He had published a translation of the Old Testament. A manuscript of a dictionary of Pushtu was found almost completed on his desk.

"Because Israel is being punished of God as a nation, does not mean that individual Jews cannot be saved in large and increasing numbers. Was it not a strange providence that made Nicholas de Lyra, a Christian Jew, the means of spiritual illumination to Martin Luther? Or do we wonder that Emmanuel Tremellius, another Hebrew Christian, was brought to England to aid in the compilation of the *Book of Common Prayer*? Time would fail me to tell about the important men of Jewish extraction who wrought nobly and effectively for the spread of the Gospel in all nations. Can we forget how a young Jew was led to America, here converted, and then went out to China to make a perfect translation of the Scriptures into the difficult Chinese tongue, so that millions of the upper classes of China might read the Holy Scriptures—Bishop Schereschowsky? Can we forget Neander and his monumental work for the students of church history? or Bishop Helmuth and his labors for higher education? or Edith Lucas, in her splendid missionary zeal in Central China? or William P. Palgrave, an Oxford graduate, and his quenchless love for the salvation of the British army officers and soldiers? or Bernard Minon, who established the first Christian mission in Bagdad? or Julius Kessler, who worked in Madagascar? or Leon Cochet, who established eight separate missions in South Africa? or Solomon Ginsburger of Brazil, who planned a campaign for the conversion of a thousand souls and before the first year ended, had led 850 to Christ? or A. D. Salmon, who went out as one of the first missionaries to Tahiti?

or Alfred Edersheim, the Oxford professor and author of a classic *Life of Christ*? or Rabinowitz, who did so much for Jewish evangelization in Southern Russia and occasioned the establishment of hundreds of Christian assemblies in that oppressed country? So the list might be added to indefinitely — Adolph Saphir, David Baron, Carl Paul Caspari, the Hershell family, David Christian Ginsburg, and many others."

Before laying aside the article, we have to remark that what the author says about Luther's debt to Nicholas de Lyra ought to be modified. While Luther found much valuable information in Lyra's commentaries, he found much also that he had to reject. To the splendid list of converts from Judaism might be added the recently deceased Rev. E. P. Block, member of our Synod, who as pastor emeritus lived in San Francisco, Cal. We hope that the interesting and edifying story of his conversion will be told in our church-papers.

A.

### Gregorian and Non-Gregorian Church Music

With all due recognition of the Gregorian chant as a fitting vehicle of religious sentiment one can hardly escape the conviction, as has frequently been expressed by some of the foremost scholars in the field of music, that the Lutheran Church has liturgical music to offer which is an improvement upon the ancient chants. One has but to study the work of the various members of the Bach family, of Spangenberg, of Keuchenthal, of Melchior Frank, of Froberger, Scheidt, Buxtehude, Crueger, Ebeling, and scores of others to be deeply impressed with the truth of the above statement. But it is interesting to find the statement in a recent number of the Catholic weekly *America* that the Roman Church is by no means committed to the Gregorian chant alone. The question came up in connection with some newspaper reports concerning the letter on church music issued by Archbishop Forbes of Ottawa. The editorial states in part: "Still more curious is the newspapers' idea that the prohibition of 'secular music' means the restriction to nothing but Gregorian. While the Church encourages the use of the chant as far as possible, while she requires it in certain parts of the liturgy, she leaves a wide range of music, polyphonic and ecclesiastical in character, as absolutely permissible. Critics of the Church's restrictions frequently overlook the fact that the distinction between Gregorian and non-Gregorian church music is not that between two types of music, one ancient and one modern, but between the *chant*, on the one hand, and the *song*, on the other. Says Dr. Becket Gibbs, eminent authority on chant and music: 'It seems to be generally agreed that the term *chant* suggests the importance of the text over the music, while that of *song* would give equal rights to both words and melody.'"

In this connection it may be well to call the attention of those pastors who have strong liturgical inclinations to some of the fine works and shorter monographs in German, which are untainted by the *hochkirchliche Schule*. One may well study Allwohn, Dietz, von der Heydt, and among the older writers in the field Harnack, Kliefoth, and even Alt rather than follow English writers in the field, most of whom are Anglicans. Even Fendt may be used with profit if his exposition is weighed with some degree of caution.

P. E. K.

### Hinduism and the "Untouchables"

Last summer . . . we called attention to the Away-from-Hinduism Movement among the Untouchables of India. Some missions are setting great store by this movement, and we find that last May the All-Religions Conference in India made the claim that ever since 1921 between ten and fifteen thousand Untouchables per month have come over to Christianity. We have no way of examining these figures, but, while it is plain that this movement presents an almost unprecedented opportunity to preach the Gospel to the heathen, it is well to remember that on the whole this is not at all a Christian movement, but an effort of the Untouchables to obtain a better economic and political status. This is borne out by a resolution adopted by the All-India Depressed Classes Conference held in Lucknow last May. It says in part: "While this conference declares that for their salvation the depressed classes should not remain in the Hindu fold, it further enjoins that the depressed classes of this country must not embrace any religion until the matter of their conversion is finally decided by an All-India Depressed Classes Conference under the leadership of Dr. Ambedkar after careful study of everything involved."

One must bear in mind that right now is a critical time in the political and economic life of India; for England is giving India a new constitution, and now seems the opportune time for the Untouchables, who numerically present a very, very large section of the population, to press for greater communal rights. Some of their activities appear seditious to the government at times, and missionaries must be on their guard lest they be used as catpaws for political purposes. It is an involved situation . . .

It appears now that the leader of the depressed classes, Dr. Ambedkar, has had secret dealings with the Hindus in order to have the depressed classes join the Sikhs en masse. The Sikhs are a sect, or denomination, of Hinduism, and it is held that by joining them the Untouchables would not leave the Hindu culture and would not forfeit their communal rights.

The Sikhs represent a reform movement that took its rise in Northern India about the time of our Lutheran Reformation. Similar reform movements have gone on in the long past, and some are still going on, so that there are many sects and divisions in Hinduism. Some of these, like the Sikhs, are directed especially against the evils of idolatry and of caste, and herein they agree with the Untouchables of today; for they hold that the Hindu religion and the caste system is the cause of their enslavement.

It is said that the Sikhs of today have largely forgotten their distinguishing teachings and practises and are again merging into general Hinduism. (They are particularly valuable soldiers in the British army.) In its basic thinking or philosophy Sikhism has always been Hindu. The Sikhs have retained the karma doctrine. Their attention is fastened on the sorrow of life, the evil of existence. They, too, ask, as we Christians often do, Why must the righteous suffer? And their answer is, Because he has brought this on himself in some previous existence. Now he must go through one incarnation after another until he is sufficiently

purified. Suicide or euthanasia, so common in Christian lands to the disgrace of the Christian name, will not help the Sikh or the Hindu because it will only aggravate the evil of existence and prolong his struggle through ages to come. What if you will next come on earth as a dog, for instance, and have to work your wearisome way up again! Hence do not kill, not so much as a fly! See what tedious existence you are interrupting! . . .

We would call attention to the asceticism connected with such a movement. By rigorous fasting and other systematic discipline the faithful and zealous Sikh will try to escape desire, which is to him the cause of all suffering. Thus they hope to reach Nirvana, the loss of personality.

We have said that there have been similar reform movements in India in the long ago. Some five, six hundred years before Christ there was a prince in India named Gautama, who likewise brooded on the sorrow of life. He went into solitude, and after years of fasting and meditation he came out and preached. He, too, preached against idolatry and the caste evil. He became known as the Buddha, and he founded a religion which still has hundreds of millions of adherents. It was driven out of India and now is found mostly in other parts of Asia.

Similarly Mohammedanism took its rise as a reform movement against idolatry. Eventually it invaded India, and Mohammedan princes subjugated it in war. Even today large parts of India are ruled by Mohammedans, and all over India Mohammedans are powerful.

And in Hinduism itself new sects still spring up from time to time.

There lies before us a speech printed, quite fully and elaborately, in the "Madras Mail" of October 21, 1936. It is by Dr. Kurtkoti, who received his Ph. D. in America and whose title is: His Holiness Jagatguru Sri Sankaracharya. He holds the highest priestly office in Hinduism, and he delivered this speech as the president of the annual session of the Mahasabha, a great religious meeting held in the city of Lahore. It will interest you if we copy some of the things he said. He stressed the all-inclusiveness, the all-comprehensiveness, the all-tolerance, of Hinduism. Christians and Mohammedans, and even atheists can be Hindus, said he. Hinduism, said he, is the eternal religion. It has no creed, no commandments, no limitations, and allows every individual complete freedom. As for idolatry, that is meant only for the ordinary people. The essential, rational, philosophical view of God in the Hindu Dharma is all-comprehensive. God is personal and impersonal; He is neither personal nor impersonal. Though your idea of God may be contrary to mine, I will never condemn it, says he. Christ's religion, which he presents as that of patient suffering, has meaning, says he, only for a few highly gifted souls and with particular limitations of time and space. The same, says he, holds true of Mohammedanism.

But Hindustan, says he, properly belongs to the Hindus. The bloody Mohammedan riots must not be allowed, and the invasions of Christian missions are improper. Hinduism itself must organize for effective missionary activity. Hindustan must be claimed for Hinduism; Hinduism must be the national religion. It lives to preserve the Aryan culture.

A large part of the speech is devoted to the movement of the Untouchables toward Sikhism. He gives his approval. Untouchability, says he, ought to go. It should be driven under ground, not to rise again, but lie there for all time. He paid tribute to Dr. Ambedkar and said: "I most emphatically say that those who wish to do so should be allowed to join that sect" (Sikhism).

The next day there arose an outcry against this part of Sri San-karacharya's speech. The Harijan Conference, amid scenes of confusion and disorder, as reported by the "Madras Mail," condemned His Holiness and condemned also Dr. Ambedkar for "entering into a conspiracy with other persons and advising Harijans [the Untouchables] to change their Dharma and enter Sikhism." The conference also "warned Christian missionaries and the Muslim Tabligh agencies and condemned their attempts to convert Harijans." "The conference resolves to raise aloft the banner of Hinduism," and it declared in favor of it without reservation. Disorder followed, the police arrived, and the conference was dispersed.

And promptly the next day, October 23, His Holiness published a withdrawal of that part of his speech. Thus, long lives Hinduism, and great is its evil power.

Just as we had written this and thought we had finished, there comes to our table another news clipping, which tells that the Church Missionary Society of England has launched a campaign to raise 25,000 pounds sterling in order to meet the mission opportunities which the movement of the Untouchables, of which we have here been speaking, represents. They call it "India's decisive hour" and "the largest single opportunity in the history of modern missions." This society is over two hundred years old, has extensive missions in many lands, has gathered far more experience than our mission has, and here you see what it thinks of the present situation, of which we, too, have maintained that it certainly presents an open door such as we have not yet experienced to preach the Gospel to heathen who formerly refused to listen. The C. M. S. is convinced to the extent of raising an extra \$125,000 just for this occasion. We are likewise convinced—and do nothing. Is it because India is an old field to us and we have already grown weary?

The situation is aptly summed up in the words of 1 Cor. 16, 9: "A great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." — H. M. ZORN, in *Central District Messenger*

### Perils Besetting the Ministry

An exchange which comes to our desk quotes the following words of Dr. Jowett: "In the midst of our fussy, restless activities, in all the multitudinous trifles which, like a cloud of dust, threaten to choke our souls, the minister must fence off his quiet and secluded hours and suffer no interference or obtrusion. I am profoundly convinced that one of the greatest perils which beset the ministry of this country is a restless scattering of energies over an amazing multiplicity of interests, which leaves no margin of time or strength for receptive and absorbing communion with God. We are tempted to be always on the run and to measure our fruitfulness by our pace and by the ground we cover in the course of the week."

J. H. C. F.

---

## Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

---

### I. Amerika

**Conferences between the Representatives of the U. L. C. A. and the A. L. C.** — In the *Minutes of the Tenth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America*, which was held in Columbus, O., October 14—21, we find a report of the Special Commission on Relationships to American Lutheran Church-bodies. While no statement could be made on a meeting with representatives of the Missouri Synod, since up to that time none had been held, the discussions with representatives of the A. L. C. are reported on at some length. On account of the importance of this section of the report we reprint it here.

"The two meetings with the commission of the American Lutheran Church were marked by free and frank discussion of the matters that seem, at the present time, to be obstacles to closer relationships.

"An initial difficulty arose from the fact that the commissions of the two bodies were working under different instructions. Your Commission was definitely charged to work for the organic union of the Lutheran church-bodies in America on the basis of the Lutheran Confessions, while the commission of the American Lutheran Church was instructed only to seek the establishment of pulpit- and altar-fellowship between the two bodies, a matter which presents no problem at all to the United Lutheran Church, inasmuch as it already grants full and free pulpit- and altar-fellowship to the members of the American Lutheran Church.

"This difference in objectives did not, however, prevent the discussion of differences, as it is self-evident that things which would prevent pulpit- and altar-fellowship would also prevent organic union. Nevertheless, your Commission has endeavored constantly to make it clear that organic union is the objective which the United Lutheran Church desires to obtain.

"The commissioners of the American Lutheran Church expressed it as their belief that there were just three matters holding the two church-bodies apart. These were the different attitudes of the two bodies toward secret societies, the difference in practise concerning pulpit- and altar-fellowship with non-Lutherans, and a difference of view concerning the Scriptures. No fault was found with the official utterances of the United Lutheran Church on any of these subjects. The doctrinal basis of our Church and the Washington Declaration of 1920 were declared to be satisfactory, but it was objected that the practise of the United Lutheran Church was not in harmony with these official statements, and new statements on these three points were asked.

"The statements on the first two points, unanimously adopted by the two commissions are as follows:—

"1. That all persons affiliated with any of the societies or organizations designated in the Washington Declaration of the U. L. C. A. as 'organizations injurious to the Christian faith' should sever their connections with such society or organization and shall be so admonished, and members of our churches not now affiliated with such organizations

shall be warned against such affiliation. Especially shall the shepherds of the flock be admonished to refuse adherence and support to such organizations.

"2. That pastors and congregations shall not practise indiscriminate pulpit- and altar-fellowship with pastors and churches of other denominations, whereby doctrinal differences are ignored or virtually made matters of indifference. Especially shall no religious fellowship whatsoever be practised with such individuals and groups as are not basically evangelical.

"Agreement has not yet been reached upon the third point. When attained, the agreements on all points will be submitted for approval.

"(Signed for the committee)

"CHARLES M. JACOBS, *Secretary*" A.

**American Antiatheistic Association.**—In the *Religious Digest* (January, 1937) Dr. T. Darley Allen, president of the American Antiatheistic Association (309 W. 72d St., New York City), is quoted in explanation of the society under his direction. A few paragraphs may interest our readers. Dr. Allen writes: "The American Antiatheistic Association has been organized to combat the rapidly growing menace of atheism, there being facts indicating that its propaganda can be successfully met, to a large degree, by interesting lectures and articles upon the evidences of religion, a subject with which comparatively few persons are familiar."—"In one year, in Great Britain, 600,000 anti-infidel books were circulated and lectures on Christian Evidences were delivered in London and other cities that did much to undermine the work of atheists and agnostics. In ten years, when Christians made extraordinary efforts to inform the public on the evidences of religion, organized infidelity in Great Britain decreased more than 40 per cent. C. J. Whitmore reported that out of twenty prominent lecturers, editors, and other workers in the propagation of infidelity whom he had known in twenty years' experience in London, sixteen had renounced 'free thought' and become preachers or lay workers in the ranks of Christianity."—"Not only are multitudes led to renounce belief in religion because of infidel propaganda, but a large percentage of them become hostile to all Christian influences and so are not likely to attend church or go where they will hear the Gospel or come under the power of Christian preaching."—"We think therefore that our organization meets a need in these days, when in high school, in college, and upon the street infidels are sparing no effort to bring men and women, and especially young people in their formative years, under the influence of antireligious propaganda."—"We shall be glad at any time to send an ordained minister to any church or club to tell of our work and to speak of the 'menace of atheism' or by a lecture on 'God,' 'Why Jesus Came,' or 'The Finality of Calvary' to show that Christianity has nothing to fear from its critics and that, as expressed by Joseph Barker, once the great head of organized unbelief in Great Britain and later a Christian, 'infidelity is madness and the religion of Christ is the perfection of wisdom and goodness.'"—It may be well for our pastors to seek contact with the organization and obtain some of its pamphlets and other publications for their own use in witnessing against atheism and its perils.

J. T. M.

**The President of the Augustana Synod on the Inspiration and Infallibility of the Bible.**—In his address at the installation of the professor of Old Testament Language and Literature in Augustana Seminary, Dr. P. O. Bersell said: "The Old Testament is a vital and indissoluble part of the canon of the Holy Scriptures. It bears within itself the testimony of the God-given word. Did we notice? In the first six verses of the Book of Zechariah, which we read at the beginning of this service, such expressions as 'the Word of the Lord came' and 'thus saith the Lord of hosts,' occurred no less than seven times. That's typical. And the Old Testament is accepted and accredited by Jesus and the apostles, and its inspiration and infallibility are part of the creed of evangelical Christendom today as always." (*Luth. Comp.*, Dec. 5, 1936.) "The inspiration and infallibility of the Old Testament"—that is a most important *and*. It does not mean much in the present day when a man declares for the "inspiration" of the Bible. The most pronounced Liberal will cheerfully admit that the Bible is "inspired." Was not Goethe, too, inspired? The signers of the notorious Auburn Affirmation did not hesitate to declare: "We all believe from our hearts that the writers of the Bible were inspired of God." Discussing this part of the creed of the Presbyterian Liberals, the *Presbyterian* of April 19, 1928, said: "It is clear, however, that this does not mean that they were so inspired of God as to preserve them from error in their statement of facts or as to render them authoritative in their statement of doctrine. The Affirmers are united in holding that the General Assembly 'spoke without warrant of the Scriptures or of the Confession of Faith' in asserting that 'the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture *as to keep them from error*.' . . . The inspiration, then, that this creed ascribes to the Bible is such as leaves us free not only to regard certain of its statements of facts as untrustworthy, but to reject its explanation even of recorded facts which we accept as historical." "Inspiration of the Bible" does not mean much. But "inspiration and infallibility" means a real inspiration, a verbal, plenary inspiration.

We should like to quote, for a different reason, another passage from Dr. Bersell's address. "Our seminary still requires the study of the Hebrew language on the part of those who are to receive the degree of Bachelor of Divinity. That study and that degree is not indispensable for service as a pastor; but our seminary still maintains the high ground that this is one measure of the intelligence quotient in Biblical scholarship. How long in this sense the prophets will live among us I do not know. But this I do know that, when the study of Old Testament literature will be dropped from the curriculum of our seminary, then it will no longer be a Lutheran institution." This last statement might be phrased somewhat differently, but the meaning is clear. E.

**"Do Not Trust in Feeling."**—My friends, do you think you can control your feelings? I am sure, if I could control my feelings, I never would have any bad feelings; I would always have good feelings. But bear in mind Satan may change our feelings fifty times a day, but he cannot change the Word of God; and what we want is to build our hopes of heaven upon the Word of God. When a poor sinner is coming up out

of the pit and just ready to get his feet upon the Rock of Ages, the devil sticks out a plank of feelings and says, 'Get on that'; and when he puts his feet on that, down he goes again. Take one of these texts: 'Verily, I say unto you, he that heareth My Word and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.' That rock is higher than my feeling. And what we need is to get our feet upon the rock, and the Lord will put a new song in our mouths." Luther might have written this. It was written by D. L. Moody. Speaking of the Moody Centenary, which is being celebrated this year, *Conc. Theol. Month.* said in its last issue: "While Moody's theology was not altogether Scriptural, the force and simplicity with which he preached the great tidings of redemption have always been justly admired." The gem here presented is given a prominent place in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1936, page 186.

"Do not trust in feeling"—that is genuine Lutheran theology. Let us look a while longer at this part of Luther's theology. Prof. E. Sommerlath writes in the *Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzg.* of January 1: "Aller Psychologismus, jedes Sichberauschen am Erlebnis, an der Gewalt der Gefuehle und am Aufwallen der Andacht ist ihm [Luther] feiger Selbstbetrug. Die Gewohnheit des Menschen unserer Tage, an der Waerme, an dem Hitzegrad seiner Erlebnisse die Wirklichkeit zu messen, ist ihm fremd. Er reflektiert nicht ueber sein *Schuldgefuehl*, sondern redet von der objektiven Verhaftung in des Teufels Reich. . . . Darum geht es auch nicht um *Friedensgefuehle*, sondern um die unumstoesslichen *Tatsachen*, mit denen uns Christus erloest hat. Auf das Gefuehl kommt es nicht an. Es ist Gnade, wenn Gott etwas fuehlen laesst, aber Glaube kann sein mit Fuehlen, ohne Fuehlen, ja gegen alles Fuehlen. Ja, das Gefuehl truegt gar oft. Denn 'es ist ein Wunderding: wer da keine Suende hat, der fuehlt und hat sie, und wer da Suende hat, der fuehlet sie nicht und hat keine.' (W. A., 18, 493, 18 ff.)" Look up this reference for further study in the St. Louis ed., IV, 1682.

"Do not trust in feeling," says Moody; says Luther: "God will not have us rely on anything else or cling with our heart to anything that is not Christ in His *Word*, be it never so holy and full of the spirit. Faith has no other foundation on which to stand. . . . What are you about—running hither and thither and torturing yourself with anxious and despairing thoughts as though God had withdrawn His grace and there were no longer any Christ, and you could have no peace unless you find Him in yourself and feel that you are holy and without sin: all that is of no avail; it is altogether lost labor and toil. . . . All is lost and your quest for Christ is futile; only one thing serves and that is that you turn away from yourself and all human comfort and yield yourself entirely to the *Word*." (XI, p. 453 ff.)

"Satan may change our feelings," says Moody, and Luther says: "If, therefore, you are guided by your feeling, it is impossible that you can maintain yourself. You *feel* that God has forsaken you? . . . Satan would have you guided by what you *feel*, not by that which you do not *feel*. Therefore you must live by faith; that is, you must not heed your *feeling*, but stand up against these devilish thoughts firm and unmoved." (IV, 1268.)

"Es ist Gnade, wenn Gott etwas fuehlen laest" — in God's own way. Luther: "Faith clings to things that it does not see, feel, or apprehend by means of the senses. It is rather a trusting reliance on God, on whom it is willing to risk and stake everything, not doubting that it will win; and that is certainly the outcome. *And the feeling and sensation will come, too, unsought and undemanded*, in and by this faith and reliance." (XI, 1577.)

E.

**Do We Deserve It?** We speak of praise expressed in a recent article of the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod). Discussing the question whether it would not be better for the Lutheran Church of America to have bishops rather than presidents, and proposing the plan of dividing the whole Lutheran Church of America into twenty-nine dioceses, the author says: "I am further in favor of organic union of all Lutherans in the United States, to be accomplished only by forgetting small, petty differences and sentimentalities of the past and gathering under the truly Lutheran progressive banner of the Missouri Synod with its unsurpassed dogmatic stability, its splendid parochial-school system, and its closed Communion — providing the Synodical Conference agreed to the form of government as above advocated." The plan of the writer may appear so Utopian as to put it outside the sphere of serious consideration and discussion. We are referring to the article because of the characteristics ascribed to our Synod: truly Lutheran progressiveness, unsurpassed dogmatic stability, splendid parochial-school system, and closed Communion. The words quoted, written by a friend in an opposing camp, are deeply humbling and should result in some heart-searching in our own midst.

A.

**Something about the Mennonites.** — Mr. G. R. Alexander, in charge of a question-and-answer service on Social Security for the readers of a metropolitan daily, writes in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 6: "From an utter stranger the postman recently brought me a very thought-provoking letter. 'I am writing in behalf of the thousands of Mennonites who work in industries covered by the Federal Social Security Act,' it said. 'As a people, we have no objection in the least to giving the Government an account as provided by law. But we have conscientious scruples in regard to receiving the benefits. It has always been customary for each congregation to take care of its own poor, which is also Scriptural, according to Matt. 26, 11. What we especially plead for at this time is that some provision be made to allow us to pay our regular dues in the regular order as provided by the law, but to be exempted from receiving the benefit.'" Later on in the article Mr. Alexander comments on this case thus: "The Mennonites have conscientious scruples, and always have had, against insurance in any form. Yet they are law-abiding to the extent that they are willing to 'render unto Caesar' the tax if only they can be exempted from its returns in the form of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance. But should they pay — as the board ruled they must — for something their religion will not permit them to buy?" Our readers will be particularly interested in one point presented in this case. On account of that point the matter is here presented. It is the statement: "It has always been customary for each congregation to take care of its own poor."

E.

**The "Honesty" of Liberals.**—Mrs. Pearl Buck, who recently resigned as a missionary (in China) of the Northern Presbyterians, in consequence of pressure by the Fundamentalists of that denomination, is a voluminous, but clever author, whose *Good Earth* has been cinematized and will thus be presented to millions throughout the world. Recently another novel by Mrs. Pearl Buck appeared, entitled *The Exile*, which was published in serial form in the *Woman's Home Companion*. In a criticism on that novel submitted by Mrs. Nettie Du Bose Junkin to the *Woman's Home Companion* (but unfairly rejected by that periodical) it is pointed out that *The Exile* grossly misrepresents two Presbyterian missionaries. *Christianity Today* has now published Mrs. Junkin's criticism, and from it we quote parts to show the utter dishonesty of modernistic writers, also when they compose other than theological writings. Admittedly Pearl Buck based her story on facts in the lives of her parents, Dr. and Mrs. Sydenstricker, and by inserting herself into the book, she has tried to convince her readers that hers is a reliable account of their life. But just in that way she, as Mrs. Junkin shows, makes "unfair and cruel impressions," detrimental to the Christian faith and profession. A few examples will prove this. Andrew Stone (the hero of the story) as a missionary is cold and distant with the converts, while Dr. Sydenstricker (who is represented by the fictitious Andrew Stone) as man, friend, and preacher was greatly beloved by the Chinese. Andrew Stone does not love his family, because his mind is "on the souls of men, always their souls." Dr. Sydenstricker loved his family and on his itinerating trips was always talking about his loved ones. Andrew Stone does not enjoy a joke and suppresses his wife's bubbling merriment, but Dr. Sydenstricker was noted for his jokes and was good company. Andrew Stone is so devoted to the printing of his Chinese New Testament that his wife and children are deprived of many needful comforts. Dr. Sydenstricker and his family had as many comforts and as nice a home as other missionaries. As Andrew Stone is a misrepresentation of the writer's father, so Carrie Stone of *The Exile* is a misrepresentation of her mother. Carrie Stone does not love her husband, while Mrs. Sydenstricker was a devoted wife, who always admired her husband and lived in joy and happiness to the end of her life. In the heart of Carrie Stone there is bitterness against God, while Mrs. Sydenstricker drew all the closer to the heart of the heavenly Father as her trials increased. Carrie Stone teaches the Chinese only social improvements, while Mrs. Sydenstricker taught and preached the Gospel. Carrie Stone lives striving to find God; she does not think her prayers are answered and never trusts the loving Savior, dying without Him and hoping that her good life might bring her a reward. But Carrie Sydenstricker, the mother of Pearl Buck, died trusting in the atoning blood of Jesus Christ and happy in the anticipation of life everlasting through faith in Christ Jesus. "What reason can there be for writing such a story, and about one's own parents?" queries Mrs. Junkin, the writer of the criticism. But does not the answer perhaps lie in the very Modernism of Pearl Buck? Andrew Stone and his wife Carrie are the reflections of her own unbelieving mind and instruments by which she means to spread her modernistic propaganda.

Or can it be true that, when writing of her saintly parents, she misrepresented them because she so greatly hates orthodox Christianity? Certainly, those who read *The Exile* will not cherish the orthodox Christian missionaries who go into the world to preach the Gospel, but will regard them as bigoted, disagreeable, hateful people, not worthy of any consideration at all. It is quite likely that *The Exile* was meant to be a subtle means to suppress orthodox mission-work in China and to foster and further the modernistic mission-work of which Pearl Buck herself is a champion.

J. T. M.

**Statistics.**—According to Dr. George Lynn Kieffer the Lutherans of the United States and Canada in 1935 contributed just two mills more per capita for benevolences than in 1934. He says that there are 16,772 congregations in the United States and Canada, with a membership of 3,194,304 confirmed persons, and that these contributed \$7,511,314, which makes a per-capita gift of \$2.351, while the last figures for 1934 read \$2.349. Adding all contributions made, those for congregational expenses as well as those for benevolences, one finds, according to Dr. Kieffer's figures, that the per-capita contribution in the United Lutheran Church in America was \$13.141, in the American Lutheran Conference \$13.041, in the Synodical Conference \$13.397, and in all other Lutheran bodies \$7.937. In December, 1935, the Lutherans in the United States and Canada numbered 12,522 pastors, 4,677,813 baptized members, 3,194,304 confirmed members, and 2,602,543 communing members.

A.

**Brief Items.**—When a correspondent of the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) in the issue of January 14 urged his brethren to assist in combating "discrimination against the *Lutheran Hour*" and pleaded that "we Lutherans, regardless of synod, join in protesting such a situation (referring to the fact that every minute of the *Lutheran Hour* has to be paid for, while the National Broadcasting Company gives free time for a religious broadcast to the Federal Council of Churches, the Catholics, and the Jews), the editor appended this note: "Dr. Maier's messages are indeed splendid, and we urge all Augustana members to 'tune in' on WLW every Sunday afternoon at 3.30 o'clock. For the information of our correspondent, however, it should be stated that lack of cooperation with the Missouri Synod is not due to unwillingness on the part of other Lutheran groups, but to Missouri's own attitude of exclusiveness." The following issue of the *Lutheran Companion* contained an article by an Augustana synod pastor which spoke of the good impressions the author received when he visited a Missouri Synod church in Minnesota. We are grateful for these manifestations of good will; but candor compels us to ask the question, Can the exclusiveness of the Missouri Synod be blamed for the divided condition of the Lutheran Church in America? The Missouri Synod objects to the course of the Augustana Synod with respect to certain matters of doctrine and practise, and it holds that Augustana, by continuing in that course, erects barriers between itself and Synodical Conference Lutherans and that hence the excluding is done not by Missouri, but by the Augustana Synod. The unbiased observer will of course wish to know whether the strictures of the Missouri Synod are tenable and whether they pertain to

things concerning which the Word of God has rendered a decision. As to that question we have to say that among these matters is the question of pulpit-fellowship with heterodox people and that of chiliastic. Let these issues be examined in the fear of God and on the basis of the Scriptures and the Confessions, and then let the question be answered whether the charge of exclusiveness must be leveled against Missouri or its opponents. — On January 16 Clarence A. Barbour, president of Brown University since 1929 and at one time president of Rochester Theological Seminary and a leader of the Baptists, departed this life. — The Christian laity seems to be waking up here and there to a realization of its rights. In Newark, N. J., Rev. L. Hamilton Garner, minister of the Universalist Church of the Redeemer, was compelled to resign because of radical speakers whom he now and then presented to his congregation in a Sunday evening forum conducted in his church. — In the future doctrinal dissertations in Germany must always be written in the German language, which means that the venerable Latin may no longer be employed for this purpose. *Sic transit gloria mundi!* — Writing on the work of Dwight L. Moody, the centennial of whose birth is observed this year, the *Living Church* pays him this tribute: "He made many converts, not by sensational, revivalistic methods, but because of his ability to speak in the every-day language of ordinary life. Those who have personal recollections of his preaching or others who have read of his remarkable meetings in America and England, whatever their religious convictions, cannot fail to pay tribute to the genuineness and sincerity of his work. His power lay not merely in his own faith, but in his ability to express that faith in simple terms and to translate it into the common language of daily life. By comparison with the preaching from the pulpits of his day he is seen now as one of whom it may be said that he reflected the spirit of Him whom the common people heard gladly because He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes." It reminds us that our sainted Pastor F. W. Herzberger, the unforgettable city missionary of St. Louis, many years ago made the statement that, as far as presentation was concerned, he took Moody as his model because of the simplicity and directness of his style. — It must be a difficult matter to crown a king. Westminster Abbey, where the coronation of King George VI is to take place some time in May, was closed to the public on January 4 and will remain closed to the time of the coronation in order that the necessary preparations may be made. — How much the personal equation counts in our endeavors to influence other people is brought out by Bishop Charles Fisk in a review which he writes of a book from the pen of H. F. Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London. "After all, he [i. e., the Bishop of London] is himself the best argument for his beliefs. Looking back into his long life, he says that it is not so much what men have said which has convinced him as what these men have been and the impression their Christian character has left; in the same way it is his own experience which counts in this persuasive appeal, and the candor and sincerity of his argument finds its real strength in his sympathy and understanding and in the radiant conviction which gives hopefulness and joy to his long ministry."

A.

## II. Ausland

**Die Unterschiede zwischen lutherisch und reformiert.** In zwei sehr brauchbaren Flugschriften sind in der letzten Zeit auch dem Volk drüben die Unterschiede zwischen lutherisch und reformiert wieder neu vor Augen geführt worden. Wir beziehen uns hier auf zwei Flugschriften für das lutherische Volk: „Was unterscheidet uns Lutheraner von den Reformierten?“ von Lie. Fr. Priegel, Seminardirektor in Breslau; und „Lutherisch oder reformiert?“ von Hans Schomerus (Verlag des Martin-Luther-Bundes, Erlangen, 1933; der zweiten Reihe sechstes Heft, zweites Tausend). Beide sind beim Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O., zu haben, und beide könnten auch in unsern Kreisen mit Segen gelesen werden. Auch kosten beide nur wenige Cent. In beiden werden wir hier und da den Verfassern nicht zustimmen können, was aber den Wert der Flugschriften, aufs Ganze gesehen, nicht beeinträchtigt. — Dies soll nicht etwa eine Bücherbesprechung sein; immerhin ist auch für uns von Wichtigkeit, daß wir die abgrenzenden Differenzen zwischen lutherisch und reformiert im Auge behalten. Die Gefahr liegt nämlich nah, daß auch die lutherische Kirche hierzulande wie einst der Pietismus Bahnen einschlagen möchte, die ihren Ursprung in Genf haben. Führen wir uns daher einige wenige Gedanken vor, die besonders Priegel in seinem Flugblatt zu bedenken gibt. In bezug auf das *principium cognoscendi* in der Theologie unterscheiden sich die beiden Denominationen, wie Priegel darlegt, in der Theorie nicht. Und doch, schon hier bei der Bestimmung der Quelle der Lehre und des Maßstabes ihrer Beurteilung tritt uns gleich der trennende Grundunterschied entgegen, daß während die lutherische Kirche in der Tat nichts anderes neben der Schrift gelten läßt, die reformierte Kirche in der Ausführung und Begründung der Lehre einen zweiten Maßstab neben der Schrift anerkennt, der der Vernunft entnommen ist. Hier schwiebt nämlich den Reformierten der rationalistische Grundsatz vor, daß das Kreatürliche das Göttliche nicht aufzunehmen vermag. D. Pieper behandelt dies Prinzip in seiner „Christlichen Dogmatik“ sehr ausführlich, und die Sache ist es wert, daß man das von ihm Dargelegte sehr genau prüft und in sich aufnimmt. (Vgl. Christ. Dogm., I, S. 25 ff.) Gerade von hier aus erklärt sich auch der gegenwärtige Modernismus in den reformierten Kreisen. Swingleis altes Axiom „Gott gibt uns nichts zu glauben auf, was die Vernunft nicht lapieren kann“ hat hier praktisch und konsequent seine Anwendung gefunden. — In der Lehre von Gott betont Priegel besonders einen Differenzpunkt zwischen uns und den Reformierten. In Christo Jesu ist uns Gott wesentlich Vater. Was uns mit Gott verbindet, ist das kindliche Vertrauen zu Gottes Vaterliebe. Priegel sagt sehr schön: „Wir wissen, daß uns das Herz unsers Gottes gehört.“ „Er ist mein Gott, wie Luther nicht müde wird immer wieder zu betonen.“ „In der Taufe sind wir in Jesu Christo, unserm Heiland, zu Gottes Kindern gemacht und in seine Liebes- und Gnadengemeinschaft aufgenommen worden.“ Anders aber sieht der Reformierte an diesem Punkt. Der Reformierte weiß wohl, daß Gott den Seinen der Vater ist; allein dieses Verhältnis verschwindet ihm fast völlig, weil er in Gott vor allem den Herrscher, den absoluten König, sieht, dem gegenüber der Gehorsam die notwendige und ausschlaggebende Haltung ist. Der Reformierte kommt zu Gott, nicht wie ein Kind zum Vater, sondern wie ein Untertan zum souveränen Despoten.

dem sich der Mensch bedingungslos zu unterwerfen hat. So auch wieder jetzt Karl Barth. Selbst das Evangelium ist nicht die frohe Botschaft, mit der Gott uns zu sich laden, unser Herz gewinnen will, die uns das Geschenk der Gnade bringt (der Reformierte kennt bekanntlich keine Gnadenmittel im lutherischen Sinn), sondern es ist der fordernde Anspruch Gottes an uns (so auch gerade Hodge: „Das Evangelium ist die Darlegung der Bedingungen, unter denen uns Gott auf- und annehmen will“). So ist auch der Glaube nicht das vertrauensvolle Ergriffen der Gnade (so lutherisch), sondern er ist Gehorsam (so auch wieder Barth). Und so wird denn in Praxi der Glaube zu einer menschlichen Leistung, was Luther ja immer so heftig bekämpft hat (der Arminianismus, das heißt, der reformierte Pelagianismus, ist darum auch nicht etwas dem Calvinismus Fremdes, Außenstehendes, sondern etwas, was als eine Art corollary dem praktizierenden Reformierten vor Augen schwebt). — Inhalt des göttlichen Majestätswillens ist für den Reformierten, sehr einseitig gefaßt, die göttliche Ehre, die Selbstverherrlichung Gottes (Barth: „Dem sola fide muß das soli Deo gloria übergeordnet bleiben“). Der Selbstverherrlichung Gottes diente wesentlich die Schöpfung; ihr dient aber auch der von Gott selbst geordnete Sündenfall; denn Gottes Herrlichkeit zeigt sich viel glänzender in der Seligmachung von Sündern (hier nämlich kommt die souveräne Gnade Gottes zur Geltung), als wenn die Sünde nie in die Welt gekommen wäre. Allerdings, für den Menschen ist die Sünde eigentlich deswegen Sünde, weil sie als Ungehorsam Gottes Ehre verlebt (was ja an sich nicht verlebt ist, aber doch von den Reformierten ganz einseitig betont wird). Die Wiederherstellung der Ehre Gottes kommt immer in erster, die Rettung der sündigen Menschen erst in zweiter Linie in Betracht. — Die Heiligung ist dem Reformierten nicht Ausdruck der Liebe und Dankbarkeit gegen Gott, eine edle Frucht, die der rechtfertigende Glaube notwendig herborrust, sondern vorwiegend ein Gehorsam, der der Ehre Gottes dient. — Von hier aus verstehen wir auch die Lehre von der Prädestination, wie sie besonders Calvin entwidelt hat, eine Lehre, die wohl in manchen reformierten Bekennnissen abgeschwächt, aber nie eigentlich aufgehoben ist (selbst nicht im Heidelberger Katechismus, auch nicht in der Helvetischen Konfession). Doch, der Raumangst zwingt uns abzubrechen. — Nur noch einen Punkt wollen wir hier erwähnen. Lie. Priegel schreibt: „Auch der Reformierte betont mit großem Ernst die Heiligung, ja betont sie wohl noch stärker als wir [?], nicht nur, weil er in ihr den Nachweis seiner Erwählung sieht, nicht nur, weil er in der sichtbaren Kirche die Gemeinde der Heiligen zur Darstellung zu bringen sucht, sondern weil er alle Lebensgebiete als Gebiete ansieht, in denen durch Gehorsam gegen Gottes Willen Gott selbst verherrlicht werden soll, so z. B. auch das öffentliche Leben in Handel und Gewerbe und in der Politik. . . . Ist Gott der allgebietende Herr, dann muß überall sein Wille zur Anerkennung und Durchführung gelangen. Seinen Willen entnehmen die Reformierten auch für diese Gebiete der Heiligen Schrift, besonders dem Alten Testament und der Gesetzgebung Moisés. Daher wird z. B. in England das jüdische Sabbatgebot auf die Sonntagsfeier übertragen und mit aller Strenge durchgeführt. Ebenso haben sich die Reformierten, auch von der Kirche wegen, gern in der Politik betätigt. Luther betont dagegen stets sehr nachdrücklich, daß die Kirche mit Politik nichts zu tun habe. Auch auf wirtschaftlichem Gebiet will der Reformierte nicht in die Sache eingreifen.“

mierte dem Reich Gottes dienen und Gott verherrlichen. Darum ist er bestrebt, möglichst viel zu verdienen, damit er möglichst viel für Gottes Reich verwenden kann. Der Gedanke, daß Arbeit lediglich eine Tätigkeit zur Erzeugung wirtschaftlicher Werte ist, ist im reformierten Schottland entstanden, während doch der Lutheraner Freude an der Arbeit haben will, die doch aus dem Paradies stammt. Dadurch, daß man auf reformierter Seite glaubt, durch die Arbeit in Wirtschaft und Politik das Reich Gottes bauen zu können, ist es zu der in unserer Zeit so großen Gefahr gekommen, daß das Reich Gottes, daß die Kirche immer mehr säkularisiert, das heißt, verweltlicht, wird.“ Etwas anders behandelt Schomerus das Thema, aber auch hier findet der Leser immer wieder wichtige Worte und Gedanken, die des Studiums wert sind. Wir nennen nur einen: „Reformierter Glaube ist immer eine wohl begründete Überzeugung; lutherischer Glaube ist ein gewisses Vertrauen, das gar keiner Gründe bedarf.“ J. T. M.

Ein mutiges Bekennen gegen die Deutschen Christen, die sich nicht nur in Thüringen, sondern auch andernorts in Deutschland zu einer Nationalkirche unter Loslösung von der Lehre der Bibel und dem lutherischen Bekenntnis zusammenfügten, hat die Bekennende Ev.-Luth. Kirche gemeinschaftlich mit dem Lutheranischen Pfarrerkreis am 14. Oktober zu Güstrow, in Mecklenburg, abgelegt, das wir hier in kurzen Auszügen wiedergeben. Wir lesen: „1. Eine Kirchenleitung, die sich von der Heiligen Schrift und den lutherischen Bekenntnissen scheidet und Irrelehrn duldet, sie in der Kirche durchzuführen bemüht ist und ihnen selber folgt, kann in der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche nicht ertragen werden. Darum ist der deutsch-christliche Oberkirchenrat nicht unser Kirchenregiment; denn er stellt sich außerhalb der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche. Das hat sich jetzt offen gezeigt. 2. Es gibt für uns nur das eine unverfälschte und unverkürzte Evangelium. Weil wir gebunden sind an Gottes Wort, müssen wir nein sagen zur Irrelehr. Weil wir gebunden sind an unsern Herrn Jesum Christum, müssen wir nein sagen zu einer solchen Nationalkirche, wie man sie jetzt errichten möchte. Alle Gemeinden der Ev.-Luth. Landeskirche in Mecklenburg ermahnen wir: Steht fest im Glauben unserer Kirche! Laßt euch nicht verwirren! prüft die Geister an Gottes Wort! Es gibt nur einen Weg zur Einheit der Kirche: unser deutsches Volk muß sich bekennen zum Evangelium; unser deutsches Volk muß sich Mann für Mann entscheiden für den, der gesagt hat: „Ich bin der Weg und die Wahrheit und das Leben; niemand kommt zum Vater denn durch mich“, Joh. 14, 6. Gottes Heiliger Geist steht uns bei, daß wir alle, Kirchenleitung, Pastoren und Kirchgemeinden, treue Zeugen dieses Herrn werden! Und der Herr der Kirche wird allen treuen Beugendienst segnen und schaffen, daß zu seiner Zeit werde ein Hirte und eine Herde.“ Gewiß herrliche und auch gewiß treu gemeinte Bekenntnisworte. Immer klarer aber wird es, daß in Deutschland eine wahre lutherische Bekenntnisnode nur da bestehen kann, wo die Kirche vom Staat unabhängig ist und daher nach Gottes Wort und dem lutherischen Bekenntnis auch frei und ungehindert handeln kann, wie dies nötig wird. Auch die Landeskirche in Mecklenburg muß sich schließlich dem Staat und seinen Verordnungen fügen, wenn das Geld zum Unterhalt der Kirche aus dem Staatssäckel kommt. Gerade wegen der Verquidung von Staat und Kirche erleidet die lutherische Kirche Deutschlands jetzt ihre Niedenschläge; sie ist eben Staatsdienerin. J. T. M.

---

## Book Review — Literatur

---

**The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.** By R. C. H. Lenski, D. D. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 934 pages, 6×9. Price, \$4.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

"Dedicated to the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri"—these words greet the reader as he begins the perusal of this noble volume. If the author were still living, we should assure him of our gratitude for the kindly, friendly feeling expressed in these brief dedicatory words. But hardly had the book arrived and study of it had become possible when the Lutheran world was shocked by the news that Dr. Lenski had departed this life. As we sorrow over the severe loss which the Church at large and his church-body, the American Lutheran Church in particular, has suffered through his death, we are thankful that he has bequeathed to all of us this splendid heritage, a scholarly commentary on the New Testament, the various volumes of which are now, at brief intervals, appearing, among them this stately one on Romans. In describing this work, we may say that here, as in the former volumes of this commentary, one finds a literal translation of the original Greek, an explanation of difficult or striking linguistic phenomena, an exposition of the thought of the apostle, and finally a discussion of this thought with appropriate applications. All this is submitted not in pedantic adherence to a certain scheme, but with delightful freedom and freshness, the author never permitting himself to lapse into a humdrum, lifeless presentation of exegetical details. The reader will not find every little point treated on which he would like to be given information, but he will see that all major matters have been given due consideration, often at considerable length, and that which is given abounds in vital, scintillating thought.

To give an example of the author's style, we shall quote some sentences from his remarks on Rom. 16, 17, 18 (p. 918 f.):—

"Paul's admonition is devitalized in its application to us today by a specious use of the historical principle of interpretation. Who were 'those causing the divisions,' etc.? In the first place, the well-known Judaizers, who mixed Law with Gospel; then, as First Corinthians shows, a number of others, some with philosophical, some with false moral teaching. Now, it is insisted that Paul's words can be applied only to these errors and that today we cannot invoke Paul's admonition unless we are able to point to exact duplicates of these errors. Generally the case is narrowed down to the Judaizers of Paul's day, who demanded circumcision and observance of Jewish ceremonialism. And even these are painted in pure black, as men who rejected the entire Gospel. But look at those Judaizers mentioned in Acts 15, 5: 'certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed,' former Pharisees, now believers, yet errorists. In Jerusalem they dropped their error; in Galatia some appeared as separatists to divide the churches and to draw them into their separatism. He who knows his Bible will not be deceived. Paul's in-

junction is not to keep away only from total rejecters of the Gospel—what Christians ever needed such a warning? His injunction is to keep away from believers who are errorists and teach falsely. Not only the exact duplicates of the errorists of Paul's day are to be shunned, as though no new ones could arise, as though new ones do not divide, tear, and set traps, as though all errorists, new and old, great and small, are not related, all in the same class; but, according to Paul himself (15, 4), 'whatever things were written before, for our instruction were they written,' to be fully applied, not devitalized, evaded. Give up the effort to make Paul even a mild unionist.

"18) The very first word generalizes: *οἱ τοιοῦτοι*, 'such,' the ones Paul has met and any others who may yet appear. Paul here characterizes all errorists in and by their error, first as far as the Lord is concerned, then as far as the innocent Christians are concerned. Too little attention is paid to the meaning of *δούλεύοντος*, just as we found in 14, 18. 'Not our Lord Jesus do they serve' does not mean—as if the verb were *διακονέω*—that they do not render Him the benefit of their service; but that they are not acting the part of slaves who obey as slaves, obey without question every word of 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' to whom as *our Lord* all of us (you Romans and I) are slaves. In the very next verse Paul has the contrast: 'Your obedience' has become publicly known, *i. e.*, you are slaves who do obey our Lord as Lord, and it is so evident, has been proved to such an extent, that all men who at all know you know it. As we have seen, many of the Romans were actual slaves to earthly masters; this word about obeying the heavenly Lord went home to them much more effectively than it does to us, who have only heard of slaves. They knew what masters did with recalcitrant slaves. These got the lash or worse. Such evil slaves are all 'such' as teach contrary to their heavenly Master."

In the section on Rom. 8, 28—30 the author takes the view of Dr. Stellhorn, holding that here the *intuitu-fidei* trope of the doctrine of election is taught. He is fair inasmuch as he does not conceal that such eminent authorities as Cremer-Koegel and Moulton-Milligan take a different view of the meaning of the verb *foreknew*. But that he misunderstands the position of many of those who disagree with him when he assumes that their definition of the divine foreknowing as *einen Willensakt Gottes, einen goettlichen Ratschluss* excludes or eliminates *knowledge*, is very evident. He writes (p. 563): "Both linguistically and doctrinally it is impossible to eliminate the *knowing* and to substitute for it an act of *willing, a decree*." If we here think of the teaching of our fathers, we certainly must say that it never was their intention to eliminate *knowing* from the complex content of the verb *προγνώσκω*. What they contended for was that not mere foreknowledge was spoken of in this verb, a point which Lenski himself agrees to when he defines *γνώσσειν* with the old dogmaticians as a *noscere (nosse) cum affectu et effectu* (p. 561). Lenski, it is true, repudiates synergism. When he stresses that *προέγνω* refers to foreknowledge, he conceives of this foreknowledge as covering "all that God's grace would succeed in working in us" (p. 563); but his view certainly empties the divine decree of election of its chief element, for essentially he reduces it to a mere act of registration in the lists

of divine omniscience, God surveying mankind and knowing those that would be believers, and, of course, saying with respect to them, as it were, "I see these people will be My own; I shall give them a Father's care." It is difficult to understand how, with this conception in mind, one can still speak of an election of grace. In brief, what Lenski champions is the well-known position of the later Lutheran dogmaticians, which they adopted in their polemics against Calvinism, but in which they overshot the mark. For a quite complete discussion of the *intuitu-fidei* view we may refer the reader to the Intersynodical Theses (also called Chicago Theses), where the incompatibility of this view with the Scriptural teaching and that of the Lutheran Confessions is set forth.

There are other points where we have to voice our dissent. In speaking of Rom. 5, 12—19, the author is unwilling to admit that objective justification is taught by the apostle. His opposition seems to be directed not so much against the doctrine of objective justification itself as against the terminology employed and the position that Paul, in v. 18 f., sets forth this doctrine. The reader may compare Lenski's remarks on p. 87: "When thus correctly used, we may speak of *allgemeine Rechtfertigung* and of *persoenliche Rechtfertigung*. Since both are equally objective, both judicial declarations made by God in heaven, it should be seen that it is confusing to call the one 'objective justification' and the other 'subjective justification.' This terminology is inexact, to say no more." — Having said this, we now reiterate that we consider this commentary a splendid achievement and hope that it will promote far and wide a better understanding and fuller appreciation of the chief epistle which God has given us through St. Paul.

W. ARNDT.

**Der Philipperbrief.** Überseht und ausgelegt von D. Dr. Paul Kaltweit. Gustav Schlömanns Verlagsbuchhandlung (Gustav Fid), Leipzig und Hamburg. 67 Seiten 5×8. Preis, kartoniert: M. 1.40.

Dieser neue Beitrag zu der neutestamentlichen Reihe der Serie „Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde“ hat wieder grohen Wert für den Theologen und Bibelforscher, der selbständig zu arbeiten versteht und zu unterscheiden weiß. Denn diese knappe Auslegung kann dem Gegeeten gute Dienste leisten, wenn sie auch in der Stelle von der Erniedrigung Christi ziemlich schwach und unzulänglich ist und es mancherorts an Klarheit und Tiefe mangelt. Hingegen kann man sich nur freuen über Sätze wie den, welchen wir unter 1, 18 finden: „Eine andere Christusbotschaft als die von Paulus und dem ganzen Neuen Testament verkündigte kann und darf es nicht geben.“ (S. 20). Es wäre sehr zu wünschen gewesen, daß der Verfasser gelegentlich ein klares Wort über die Wortinspiration der Schrift gesagt hätte.

P. G. Krehmann

**The Way of Life.** By Geo. Luecke. Third, revised edition. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 96 pages, 4×6½. Price, 40 cts.

We are sure that all who know Pastor Luecke's *Way of Life* will be heartily glad that this little gem of dogmatico-apologetic literature is presented in a third and revised edition. Written in a simple, yet dignified style, it makes ideal reading for all who are interested in the fundamentals of the Christian faith. As a gift-book to catechumens, adults as well as those of school age, it has few equals. In eleven brief, but

rich and thoroughly worked-out chapters it treats of God's existence and nature, man's destiny, the divine inspiration, authority, and inerrancy of the Bible, the God of the Bible, the Triune God, who is Love, the contrast between Christianity and unbelief, the Christian hope of salvation, repentance and conversion, reasons for joining the Christian Church, the orthodox and the heterodox churches, and lastly, the reasons why unchurched readers should join the Lutheran Church. Here a true, kindly pastor speaks to his readers out of the abundance of his faithful, consecrated heart. And he sets forth every essential truth regarding the way to life so clearly, correctly, and convincingly that we should like to see this excellent little book spread throughout our country in millions of copies. By all means let our pastors and teachers make those over whom they have charge acquainted with this fine witness to the divine truth.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

**Vicarious Atonement through Christ.** By Louis Berkhof, B. D., professor of dogmatic theology at Calvin Seminary. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1936. 184 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ . Price, \$1.50.

"The doctrine of the vicarious atonement is in discredit today." Many no longer believe it ("The modern world cannot conceive of any one still believing the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ," says the preface of our book), and many of those who still believe it no longer believe that it must remain the chief subject of their study and their preaching. To that extent they discredit it. They agree with the dean of an Episcopalian seminary who lately said: "I think we spend too much time on dead subjects. . . . I have heard of a seminary where a whole term—or was it a whole year?—was given to a course on the atonement." (See *Living Church*, Aug. 8, 1936.) But there are also those who do not consider the hours lost that are devoted to the study of the vicarious atonement. And they will gladly give their attention to what Professor Berkhof, president of the theological seminary (Grand Rapids) of the Christian Reformed Church, here writes on the necessity of the atonement, the objective nature of the atonement, the vicarious nature of the atonement, the subjective effects of the atonement together with the objections raised against this doctrine and the substitutes offered in place of the vicarious atonement. Those who have studied the chapters on the atonement in Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik* will here find valuable supplementary matter. They will be going over familiar ground and will find additional useful information on various points. Unwaveringly, unmoved by the protest of reason, Professor Berkhof stands on the Biblical teaching concerning the necessity and the vicarious nature of the Atonement.

But when he discusses the extent of the Atonement, he maintains, despite the protest of Scripture, the Calvinistic position. These are the final chapters of the book: "The Restricted Design of the Atonement" and "Objections to the Doctrine of a Limited Atonement Considered." At this point the Calvinist permits reason to dominate his theology. Calvinism has accepted reason as a safe guide in divine matters. We

hear Professor Berkhof saying that a certain teaching "does not commend itself to human reason and is also unscriptural. (P. 71.) And so he denies here that grace is universal because of rationalistic considerations. Before he gives the "proof from Scripture-passages" (p. 161), he establishes his doctrine by arguments like these: "Since God from all eternity decreed to save a certain definite number of the fallen human race, . . . it is but reasonable to suppose that He adapted the means precisely to the end which He had in view. . . . We can only suppose that He designed the necessary means also for those and for no other persons. . . . If God knows precisely, as He does, who will and who will not accept the offer of salvation, does it seem reasonable to think that He would send Christ into the world to suffer and die for the purpose of saving those of whom He is sure that they will never meet the conditions and be saved?" (P. 157.) Again: "Another argument is based on the fact that, according to the doctrine of universal atonement, as held by some, God is really exacting a double satisfaction for sin. If Christ really satisfied the demands of the Law for all men; if He made atonement or amends for all, meeting all their legal requirements, it would seem that the Law would have no further claim on them as a condition of life and could not very well exact another satisfaction of them by eternal punishment." (P. 159.) And on the strength of these bald and coarse ratiocinations the plain statements of Scripture are ignored and turned into their very opposite. Did the Lamb of God take away the sins of the world? of all men? No; for "the word *world* is sometimes used to indicate that the Old Testament particularism belongs to the past and made way for New Testament universalism. In all probability this is the key to the interpretation of the word *world* in such passages as John 1, 29; 6, 33. 51; 2 Cor. 5, 19; 1 John 2, 2. . . . The passages in 1 Tim. 2, 3. 4 and 2 Pet. 3, 9 refer to the revealed will of God that both Jews and Gentiles should be saved, but imply nothing as to the universal intent of the Atonement." (Pp. 169. 170.) Has the grace of God that bringeth salvation appeared to all men? Titus 2, 11 says so, but inspired by reason, the Calvinist says: "The *all* in this verse evidently refers to all classes of men." (P. 170.) Can one be lost for whom Christ died? Not according to the doctrine of the limited atonement. Then why did Paul say so in 1 Cor. 8, 11 and the parallel passages? "These passages do not imply that the weaker brethren could actually fall away. . . . Some commentators assume that the word *perish* in these passages does not necessarily refer to eternal damnation, but may simply mean 'embitter' or 'injure.'" (P. 170.) — The study of these sections of the book is not unprofitable. It will show that the Calvinistic teachings are not based on Scripture.

The book closes with a paragraph stating that "it is not the duty of the preacher to harmonize the secret counsel of God respecting the redemption of sinners with His declarative will, as it is expressed in the universal offer of salvation." Whatever may be meant by "secret counsel," the principle expressed is the only correct one. When reason tries to harmonize Scripture doctrines, it vitiates or destroys one or all of them. The Calvinistic reason harmonizes Scripture by eliminating the sweet doctrine of universal grace.

TH. ENGELDER

**What Is Christianity?** By Sverre Norborg, Ph. D. Translated by J. C. K. Preus, D. D. 136 pages,  $5\frac{1}{4} \times 8$ . Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. Price, \$1.00.

**How Halvor Became a Minister.** By Peer Stroemme. Translated from the Norwegian by Inga Bredesen Norstog. 192 pages,  $5 \times 8$ . Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. Price, \$1.00.

**Laur. Larsen, Pioneer College President.** By Karen Larsen. 358 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ . Norwegian American Historical Association, Northfield, Minn. Price, \$3.00. May be ordered through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Three volumes representing the Norwegian Lutheran scene, all three bearing a relation to Luther College of Decorah, Iowa, which celebrated its diamond jubilee last year. The first is a work of a Norwegian scholar, who is at the present time lecturing in this country. Norborg received early honors from the Lutheran Church of Norway and from the universities of Erlangen, Leipzig, Berlin, Oslo, and Oxford and has held pastoral positions in Norway and in New York City. From the academic side the mantle of Soederblom has fallen upon Norborg as one of the most highly talented sons of the Scandinavian Lutheran Church. He converses with ease, as did Soederblom, in five or six languages, and he can write simply. His book discusses the essence of Christianity, — the new birth, faith in Jesus Christ, and the life of daily repentance and renewal, — and it does it with a stirring, powerful appeal. Whatever faults may be found with the book, — sometimes state-church conditions are perceptible, the doctrine of the Church and of the means of grace are not prominent, — it surely has none of the leaven of synergism. The *sola gratia* is powerfully stressed. The higher criticism is rejected (p. 108). The sermon to Norborg is, as to us, "the message which an obedient witness of God has drawn forth from the Holy Scriptures under the guidance of the Spirit of God" (p. 111). The translation has been beautifully done by the president of Luther College, Dr. J. C. K. Preus. Future editions will give us the correct typography for "perusia" (parusia, p. 108) and for "insane" (inane, p. 111).

The second volume announced above is the autobiographical sketch by the late Peer Stroemme, written some forty years ago and now translated from the Norwegian. Stroemme was a gifted journalist, who never lost his Lutheran consciousness although success beckoned to him in the field of naturalistic fiction. In *Hvorledes Halvor blev Prest* he told his life-story, to a large extent the story of his experiences at Decorah and at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. In the story appear the names of men honored in Norwegian American history — Preus, Ottesen, Brandt, Koren, Larsen, Stub, Ottesen, Brandt, Muus. Stroemme's reminiscences of St. Louis, — Concordia Seminary, Dr. Walther, Schaller, his *Wasch-tante*, — embellished with wholesome humor, possess historical value, as does the entire book, as a record of an almost forgotten age.

Norwegian Americans are to be congratulated upon the high scholarship which marks the productions of the Norwegian American Historical Association and also upon their latest product, the life of Dr. Larsen by his daughter Karen. Miss Larsen teaches history at St. Olaf College and

at the diamond jubilee of Luther College was given the honorary Doctor of Letters. Her life of the distinguished Norwegian Lutheran educator is written with scholarly restraint and shows the hand of the trained historian on every page. Due to the modesty of the sainted Larsen only few autobiographical data regarding his life were available, and Miss Karen was limited to obscure pamphlets and periodicals for much of her source material. It does not appear that much of the correspondence of Dr. Larsen was available. The story of his life is told with many side-lights upon his collaborators. Very often we note the progressiveness and independence of the man's thought processes, also with reference to national (Norwegian) issues and educational questions. As is well known, Larsen for a time taught at Concordia College, St. Louis (1859-1861). There is much stirring detail regarding the slavery controversy and, of course, regarding the controversy on election. While it is evident that the author does not appreciate fully the fundamental nature of the issues involved, she remains at least fair and objective in these sections also. The defection of her father from the Missouri Synod position (by his acceptance of the Madison Agreement of 1912) is told without justifying this step or passing judgment upon it. One could wish a little more definition on this or on other points. There is a criticism in the remark that, when Larsen died in 1915, "only the very briefest note of the event was made in the organ of the Church to which he had been so closely bound" (p. 339).\* Such deficiencies — there are a few besides this detachment from underlying theological tendencies — do not detract essentially from the value of the book. It is a masterpiece of historical composition. We have nothing like it in our own synodical literature.

THEODORE GRAEBNER

*Was heißt lutherisch?* Von Hermann Sasse. Zweite, vermehrte Auflage. Chr.-Kaiser-Verlag, München. 1936. 171 Seiten 6×9.

Dieses Buch, das nach kurzer Zeit in zweiter, vermehrter Auflage erscheint, hat uns der Verfasser, der bekannte Professor der Theologie an der Universität Erlangen, freundlich zugesandt. Es ist eine in deutschländischen Kreisen fast einzigartige, treffliche Schrift. D. Sasse steht mitten im Kampfe, der jetzt die Kirche Deutschlands bewegt, und ist einer der Vorlämpfer. Er kennt wie wenig andere die lutherische Lehrstellung und hat den Mut, seine Überzeugung klar und bestimmt auszusprechen. Jede Seite fast zeigt seine gründlichen, historischen und dogmatischen Kenntnisse, und es ist ihm um die lutherische Kirche zu tun gegen die Union. Er sagt mit Recht in dem Vorwort, daß der Kirchenkampf in Deutschland „ein Kampf um die Konfessionen, ein echter Bekenntniskampf, ist. . . .“ Während die Welt den Konfessionen den Totenschein ausgestellt und das konfessionelle Zeitalter für beendet erklärt hat, sind die Konfessionen innerhalb unsers Kirchentums wieder eine Macht geworden. Vor einem Menschenalter war man fast allge-

\* The present reviewer was then editor of *Der Lutheraner* and of the *Lutheran Witness* and also responsible for the department of *Lehre und Wehre* which passed in review contemporary history. Well does he remember the distress, and quite insoluble dilemma, which confronted him and his coeditors when Dr. Larsen's death was reported. It became a question of harmonizing the stalwart attitude in doctrinal matters that had characterized the sainted Norwegian Lutheran leader and his later acceptance of the Madison Theses. The suggestion of reasons and motives involved was unescapable. . . . The result was the brief objective notice in *Lehre und Wehre*, 1915, p. 131.

mein der Überzeugung, daß die Zukunft des Christentums auf dem Gebiete der „Gefinnung und Tat“ liege, daß aber das dogmatische Zeitalter der christlichen Religion abgeschlossen sei. Allen Berechnungen und Vorhersagen der besten Kenner des Geisteslebens zum Trotz stehen wir heute an der Schwelle eines neuen dogmatischen Zeitalters, und zwar nicht nur in Deutschland. Denen, die uns einreden möchten, daß Christentum habe die Macht über die Geister verloren und die Menschen fürchten heute nicht mehr für religiöse Überzeugungen, müßte es doch zu denken geben, daß die Christenheit, soweit wir das abschätzen können, in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten mehr Märtyrer und Konfessoren in den Tod, in die Verbannung und ins Gefängnis hat gehen sehen als in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten“. (S. 3. 4.) Sasse behandelt nun, wie es die gegenwärtige Kirchenlage erfordert, ausführlicher die Lehrunterschiede zwischen der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirche und hat in seiner Kampfestätigkeit „die erschütternde Erfahrung“ gemacht, „daß viele von den deutschen Führern die Lehre ihrer Kirche . . . gar nicht mehr so kennen, wie es um der Sache willen notwendig wäre“. (S. 5.) Und er betont: „Wie nach dem Worte des Paulus niemand das Bekenntnis, daß Jesus der Herr ist, sprechen kann, ohne durch den Heiligen Geist, so kann auch niemand die Konföderationsformel als wirkliches Bekenntnis unterschreiben, ohne durch den Heiligen Geist“. Es kann niemand die Augustana wirklich als das Bekenntnis seiner Kirche annehmen, in dessen Herzen es nicht jubelt „Nun freut euch, liebe Christen g'mein“. (S. 6.) Wir möchten noch mehr Worte des Verfassers anführen, müssen es jedoch hierbei bewenden lassen; aber wir empfehlen diese Schrift nicht nur denen, die eine genauere Einsicht in die kirchlichen Kämpfe in Deutschland nehmen wollen, sondern ganz allgemein. Auch hier in Amerika sind nach unserer Überzeugung Lehrkämpfe, Bekenntniskämpfe, in Sicht, und es gilt, daß jeder Theolog, jeder Pastor ordentlich gerüstet ist für solche Kämpfe. Es wird sich da auch um die Frage handeln: „Was ist lutherische Lehre?“ vielleicht nicht gegenüber unierter oder unionistischer Lehre — denn im Wesen des Unionismus und der unierten Kirche liegt, daß sie eben keine feste bestimmte Lehre hat —, sondern andern Richtungen gegenüber. Wir wünschen dem um die lutherische Kirche so ernstlich kämpfenden Verfasser von Herzen, daß er nun auch die rechten praktischen Folgen aus seiner Lehrstellung ziehen und ins Werk setzen möchte.

L. Fürtlinger

**Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Convention of the Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference of North America. 1936. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 125 pages, 6×9. Price, 25 cts.**

This report is worth reading just at the present time. Everywhere men are speaking of Lutheran union, a cause to which the Synodical Conference is committed. One of its objects is, as the presidential address points out, “the uniting of all Lutheran synods of America into one orthodox American Lutheran Church.” A further remark in this address will discourage those who are aiming at a unionistic union: “By the grace of God the Synodical Conference has remained true to its principles, has remained a conference of Lutheran synods standing firmly and unequivocally upon the inspired and inerrant Word of God and upon the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.” And now let all those who are speaking and writing and conferring on a Lutheran union study Professor Hoyer’s essay on “Union Movements in the Church,” as much of it as has been presented at Indianapolis. Let them take to heart what

is said about those "unions which are worse than dissension, union at the expense of the truth," about formulas "veiling the difference" and "vague, ambiguous phrases"; also that from the early days of Christianity men who stood for a union *in the truth* were charged with "obstinacy" and "were told that with their stubbornness they stood in the way of progress and advancement for the Church"; nor let them forget how Luther dealt with those who, though differing with him, were willing to discuss the differences with a view to their removal: "Since we do not yet understand each other fully, it is well to exercise mutual kindness and always hope the best until all turgid waters have settled." (P. 40.) — The report is worth reading, too, because of the second essay, by Dr. J. T. Mueller: "The Glory of the Gospel Ministry," which should be read at the present time and at all times. — The members of the Synodical Conference will also want to be kept informed on the state and progress of the Colored Missions, just now particularly with regard to the work begun in the Negro's homeland, Africa. — (On page 13, line 13, substitute for "Lutherans" *they*; p. 34, l. 32, for "Luther" *Er*; p. 76, l. 14, read: "unless we retain the Gospel of salvation by grace, we shall have, etc.")

TH. ENGELDER

**Brightest Light for Darkest Africa.** A mission-story book about the Ibibios of Ibesikpo, explaining their country and their customs. By John Theodore Mueller, Th. D., member of the Missionary Board for Colored Missions. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 35 pages,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ . Price, 10 cts.; dozen, 96 cts., and postage; 100, \$7.00, and postage.

It is proper that our theological journal also should draw attention to this interesting, well-written brochure, in which in thirteen chapters pertinent information is given on the African field where the Synodical Conference has begun a promising mission. The many questions that all those interested ask as to climate, rainfall, travel, economic, social, and religious conditions in this field are here briefly discussed. The numerous illustrations help to make the little work appealing to our people.

W. ARNDT

**Der Heiland der Welt.** Bibelstunden über die sieben Worte Jesu am Kreuz. Von Hermann Bezzel. D. Gundert-Verlag, Stuttgart. 106 Seiten 4 $\times$ 6. Preis: Kartoniert, RM. 1; Leinen: RM. 1.40.

Diese sieben Betrachtungen sind in ihrer Form einfache Predigten, die, wie der Herausgeber, Lic. Johannes Rupprecht, schreibt, "die Grundwahrheit unsers evangelischen Christenglaubens, das Versöhnungs- und Erlösungswerk unsers gottmenschlichen Mittlers" betonen. Die Sprache wird allerdings in dieser Übergangsperiode in unsern Gemeinden vielen schon zu schwer sein, aber Pastoren, die sich nach neuem Material für Passionspredigten umsehen, werden in diesen Betrachtungen wertvolle Gedanken finden können. Hin und wieder können wir dem Verfasser nicht ganz folgen, wie wenn er behauptet: "Worte wie die leusche Himmelbraut" sollten nie über evangelische Lippen gleiten. Träume wie von 'der Mutter Gottes' sollten in dem Herzen eines nüchternen Protestant nie Raum haben." (S. 40.) Während wir allerdings Bedenken hätten, den ersten Ausdruck zu gebrauchen, dürfen wir uns doch vor dem zweiten nicht scheuen, da er durchaus auf biblischem Boden beruht.

P. E. KREHMANN

**Thirty-Fifth Annual of Convention Associated Lutheran Charities, September 1—4, 1936, at Detroit, Mich.** 108 pages, 6×9. Price, 50 cts. May be ordered from Rev. J. H. Witte, 304 Tuscola Rd., Bay City, Mich. Reprints of Pastor Gloe's paper may be had for 10 cts.

This report contains all the addresses which were delivered before the 1936 convention of the Associated Lutheran Charities as well as a summary of all discussions in the afternoon institutes and the papers of the sectional meetings. Every person who desires to remain abreast of the times with regard to the work of our Lutheran organizations in the field of charity and social welfare should read and study this report.

P. E. KRETMANN

**Eingegangene Literatur**

**Luthertum**, Heft 12, 1936, enthält eine Abhandlung des Erlanger Kirchenrechters Hans Viermann über „Anglikanische Fragen“ sowie einen Artikel von N. H. Søe (Kopenhagen) über „Die christliche Liebe und das Leben im Beruf“. Die Randbemerkungen von Hans Schomerus und ein gründlicher Bücher- und Zeitschriftenbericht finden sich auf den letzten Seiten. — Heft 11 und 12, 1936, der **Theologie der Gegenwart** bringen Besprechungen auf dem Gebiet der systematischen Theologie.

**Luthertum** für Januar 1937 enthält wichtige Artikel: Simon Schößel über „Das angenehme Jahr des Herrn“, Hans Preuk über „Gedanken zum Stilgefüge der Gegenwart“, Otto Henning Rebe über „Lutherische Lehre, Deismus und Mythis“. Außerdem finden sich die Randbemerkungen von Hans Schomerus und der Bücher- und Zeitschriftenbericht von Johannes Bergdolt. — Die Januarnummer der **Theologie der Gegenwart** bringt Besprechungen über neuere Erhebungen auf dem Gebiete der Kirchengeschichte.

*From Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.:* —

**These Three.** Devotional Thoughts for the Quiet Hour. By the Rev. G. H. Knight. 174 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

*From the Round Table Press, Inc., New York:* —

**The Second Book of Story Talks.** By Simeon E. Cozad. 205 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.50.

---

**NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS**

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Apr 37" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.